1-1-1991

Gatekeepers of the special education regulations.

Hazel Elizabeth Grenham
University of Massachusetts Amherst

GATEKEEPERS OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION REGULATIONS

A Dissertation Presented

by

HAZEL ELIZABETH GRENHAM

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial
fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1991

School of Education

GATEKEEPERS OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION REGULATIONS

A Dissertation Presented

by

HAZEL ELIZABETH GRENHAM

Approved as to style and content by:

Kenneth A. Parker

Kenneth A. Parker, Chair

R. W. Maloy

Robert W. Maloy, Member

Frank Lattuca

Frank Lattuca, Member

Marilyn Haring-Hidore, Dean
School of Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have contributed to this study. I should like to extend my sincere appreciation to each one of them.

The twenty one participating educators who provided the data for this study with generous amounts of time and professional insights.

Dr. Kenneth Parker, Chair of my dissertation committee for his steadfast support, availability, and encouragement during this project.

Dr. Robert Maloy, who as a member of my dissertation committee, provided important feedback on my writing and was a continual resource for new ideas and relevant research.

Dr. Frank Lattuca, who as member of my dissertation committee supported my progress and completion of this undertaking

Dr. Karen Hosking, who as my independent reader provided enormous support and encouragement, sharing her clinical and research expertise throughout this endeavor.

Dr. Harry Lee for his generous loan of a computer.

David Terjanian for his computer assistance.

Nancy Hartwig, Deborah Kehoe, and Susan Pippin who as colleagues, gave me their encouragement and support.

Hazel and Michael Durand, Jack Ingram, Jim Ingram and Siobhan Fleming , who provided enormous love, patience and great support to their mother, sustaining hope that she would eventually complete this dissertation.

ABSTRACT

GATEKEEPERS OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION REGULATIONS

MAY 1991

HAZEL E. GRENHAM, M.Ed., LESLEY COLLEGE

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Directed by: Professor Kenneth A. Parker

This study records the perceptions of special education administrators, building principals and regular and special education teachers in four neighboring North-of-Boston communities as to how each has: viewed the evolution of the special education law and its implementation process; included or excluded students with disabilities in local public schools during 15 years of state and federal mandates; mainstreamed students with disabilities; dealt with the fiscal restraints of Proposition 2 1/2; become more or less concerned with "due process" than with quality education.

Twenty-one special and regular educators from two cities with large low income populations and two

smaller, more affluent towns provided data responding to multiple choice questionnaire surveys and semi-structured interviews.

Results indicate all four systems have adopted special education mandates incorporating change at varying degrees of implementation. The two multi-ethnic and socio-economically diverse cities have been assisted with compliance through state and federal regulators and the courts, overseeing procedural implementation.

The smallest affluent suburban community studied continues to resist mainstreaming. While their affluent neighbor has successfully upheld a strong commitment to mainstreaming, evident in a more unified education system, where principals and the special education administrator share the role of gatekeeper of the regulations. Three communities' respondents described a separate system of education for students with disabilities where the special education administrator is considered the ultimate gatekeeper of the regulations.

Compliance continues to dominate and concern school administrators. Legal and technical issues are reported to overwhelm the mainstream educator who, generally, has abdicated responsibility for the student with disabilities to the specialist. The specialist has all too readily accepted this assignment.

Decentralization of special education and restructure of the mainstream, as recommended in the Regular Education Initiative, will require a metamorphosis of the gatekeeper to collaborative consultant and eventual elimination of the position special education administrator. The transition from policy to practice will occur only to the extent that regulatory agencies view educational outcomes and quality of programs as a priority, and when all educators apply the standards for special education to all education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

GATEKEEPERS OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION REGULATIONS

The history of special education delivery systems can be summarized in two words: progressive inclusion. It is proposed that the future of special education also will be describable in the same terms. The so called continuum of administrative arrangements for special education will likely be changed to eliminate remote specialized places such as the residential and day school. It is now possible to serve disabled students in neighborhood schools, and that should become the standard for all students and all schools.(Maynard C. Reynolds, 1989 p.7)[1]

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Since the adoption of Chapter 766, and Federal Public Law 94-142, Massachusetts communities have witnessed the development of a vast array of public and private programs for students with handicaps. The process has not been easy or quick to implement. Cities with large low income populations have experienced more difficulty than smaller, affluent communities in implementing this reform. In addition Massachusetts' voters passed a tax measure limiting resources available to budgets to 2 1/2 % of assessed property valuation and ended the fiscal autonomy of local school boards.

"The juxtaposition of state and federal mandates to provide expensive services, with the mandate to limit spending is forcing local school officials to make very difficult choices"(Hausman, Bonnie S. ,1985 p.13). [2] In a society where children are entitled to achieve their maximum potential (David D v. Dartmouth School Committee,775 F 2d 411 1st circuit Oct 15, 1985) [3] how do school managers allocate limited resources? How do they provide quality programs for all children? Debates over budgets are local and frequent. The decisions of school administrators receive greater scrutiny than ever from taxpayers.

Educational researchers have focused on the evolution and implementation of the special education law in this state and in the nation. However there has been minimal investigation of the special education administrator's role in implementing education for the handicapped student in local districts. The special education administrator is a key middle manager who acts as a "gatekeeper" of the regulations. Are these middle managers crucial in influencing regulatory implementation? Or are there other factors to be considered which impact on enforcement of special education mandates? Is it a combination of

administrative style and constituent support or resistance which effects outcome?

The costs of special education have spiraled since inception. Of great concern to school committees and administrators are:

1. the ever rising costs of private or out-of-district placements and transportation costs.

2. state reimbursement formulas to cities and towns nave been cnanged 3 to 4 times since the impiementation of Chapter 766. This unpredictability in fiscal resources creates havoc with community budgets.

3. noncategorical criteria has created different perceptions of the standards of least restrictive and maximum potential from community to community within the state of Massachusetts.

Fueling the fire for reform in special education is the increase in the numbers of students generally classified as learning disabled. This has prompted school committees to ask the perennial question, "are these students truly handicapped?" The concern behind the question is that too much money is being spent on special education.

How have educational administrators <u>managed</u> during this mandated legislative change?

Statement of Purpose

This study records how school administrators from four neighboring North-of-Boston communities view their own actions in response to imposed mandates with loss of local control and fiscal resources. The investigation views staff perceptions of interaction between regular and special educators. Its focus is on how administrators develop programs to provide quality education for students with handicaps in the least restrictive/mainstreamed environment with consideration of the inter-and intra-constituent relationships; i.e., between school administrators and school committees; between school administrators and parents; between school administrators and the regulatory overseers from the Department of Education; and among special and regular school administrators and staff.
All four communities fell under the jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Northeast Regional Office of the Department of Education and had each been audited twice by the Department since 1978.

Two cities (Communities A and C) with large low income populations and two smaller more affluent towns

(Communities B and D) were selected for this study. The two studied cities contained mixed ethnic populations of old and new immigrants. In the first third of this century, these cities were successful centers of manufacturing and industry, and since the end of World War II, have experienced long periods of economic stagnation. Both cities are currently involved in differing phases of revitalization and redevelopment.

The two affluent towns (Communities B and D) were primarily classified as summer communities with a year round population of fishermen and service residents prior to the end of World War II. Since the 1950's they each have become "bedroom communities" with the majority of the current population commuting to Boston daily.

Together these four communities represent a cross-sectional sample of the heavily populated eastern part of the state, where older cities and newer suburbs are undergoing demographic and economic transformations. Overall state statistics indicate that a larger percentage of the student population in low income cities are referred for special education services than in smaller more affluent communities (Singer et al. 1986).[4]

In a recent study of classification in special education, Judith Singer and her colleagues from Harvard University and Boston Children's Hospital concluded that; where children live is a major factor in the classification they receive. They discovered a wide disparity among states and districts both in their definitions of disabilities and in the tests used to identify disabilities (J. D. Singer et al. 1986 p 319-337).[5]

There is a growing or persistent perception that the gap between regular and special education is narrowing by virtue of the increase in special education referrals and a coinciding increase in the special education budget percentage. However the friction and competition between the two forces has widened. Is this due solely to lessened resources for regular education and seemingly more for special education? Is it a struggle for power within a traditionally authoritarian system?

Research Questions

1. How have educators viewed the evolution of the special education laws and process?

2. Why so little ownership from regular education for special education after 15 years in Massachusetts-and fourteen years of Federal mandates?

3. What is the status of "mainstreaming" or integration of regular and special education students?

4. How have the fiscal restraints of Proposition 2 1/2 effected the "integration" of special and regular education students?

5. Have educators become more concerned with "due process" and parents rights than with quality education?

Rationale and Theoretical Framework of the Study

The assumptions and research questions used in this study are based on the following:

The special education mandates were developed by a strong constituency representing those who had been left out of the mainstream of education. This act greatly altered the status of the educator as sole authority in the arena of learning. It guaranteed due process, the right of a parent to be a voting member of his/her child's educational team. Massachusetts Chapter 766 and subsequent Public Law 94-142, bestowed on educators the responsibility for coordinating and

implementing the services needed. However the "how-to-'s" of administering the law where "not defined" rather they were interpreted as an "open-ended" approach (Budoff & Orenstein 1982, Bloom & Garfunkel 1981, Earley 1985, Hausman 1985, Malloy 1980).[6]

Making special education happen in schools has become the responsibility of a new group of middle managers: special education administrators and staff principals. These new professionals are caught in the middle and how they choose to do their jobs has great impact on the way special education is conducted in their districts. Additionally, the recent changes in special education laws have reinforced the dual and contradictory mandates which school administrators must implement: Provide the maximum possible development in the least restrictive setting to ensure the possibility of mainstreaming within the fiscal constraints of Proposition 2 1/2.

Chapter 766 also altered instructional implementation. One teacher in an average size class of 25-30 students, responsible for motivating students to learn, generally taught to the middle level of class ability. Special Education mandated individualized instruction to the level of each students ability.

Special education teachers had smaller numbers of children, access to more materials, etc. Regular educators had fewer resources and more students. The line of demarcation was quickly established between special and regular educators.

From a sociological perspective, this reaction, the educational schism between regular and special education, was predictable and consistent with societal reactions to the "haves" and" have not's". The "authority" of educational systems was being challenged. As with the civil rights movement and women's movement garnering strength during the activist period of the 1960's and early '70's, change was imposed on the status quo. The educational resistance to education of the handicapped also coincides with society's resistance to make the activities of daily living accessible to the handicapped.

The intent of state and federal legislation was to guarantee a free, appropriate education for all students with handicaps, in the least restrictive environment. The law evolved out of a grassroots constituency discontent with the options for educating handicapped children within a public school. Educators had been providing "special education" for "mentally retarded children" for years within the schools. These

classes were the only alternative to regular education within the public schools. However, the EDUCATORS were the only experts who made the decisions relative to what kind of education would be available for a student with a handicap.

Chapter 766 and the federal law P.L. 94-142 guaranteed the due process rights of parents as members of the educational team. In effect, it demanded a long overdue "partnership" between parents and schools.

Importance of the Study.

A survey/study of four special education administrative systems geographically located within a ten mile radius of each other, representing a full spectrum of the populace along the continuum from least advantaged to most, provides a cross-sectional experience and perspective of the individuals within the front-line forces of special and regular education. Administrators, teachers, social workers and counselors, these are the school personnel responsible for implementing the special education mandates: individualized education in the least restrictive setting to guarantee the maximum potential of individual development. This study has the potential to record the "how-to's" and "how-not-to's" of effective education. A history of how selected special

and regular education administrators within these systems have reacted to, resisted, denied and accepted these mandates will be presented. The information gained from this study has enormous value for the present and future practitioner in public education. There is very little research and few if any studies related to the middle level school manager since the implementation of the special education mandates.

Definition of Terms

Adaptive Learning Environments Model(ALEM): an alternative service delivery approach for serving students with special needs in regular classrooms.

Appeal: one of several options open to parents who are not satisfied with the educational plan provided by their local school system. If parents choose an appeal, an administrative hearing must be offered. Alternatives to resolution include mediation with local school administration and/or with a department of education mediator.

Bureau of Special Education Appeals: the Bureau within the Department of Education responsible for the resolution of differences between schools and parents/guardians. Chapter 766 mandates the Bureau to provide parents and schools with information on the

Appeals process: to notify the parties of their rights under the law; to attempt to mediate the dispute and to schedule a hearing at the request of either party.

CET: Core Evaluation Team/obsolete see Team Evaluation

Chapter 766: The Massachusetts Special Education Law passed in 1972 and implemented in 1974 affirmed the rights of special needs children for a free, appropriate public education. The law identifies special needs children, ages 3-22 years on the basis of their poor school performance and need for special services rather than through diagnostic labels. Parent participation is guaranteed from referral through evaluation and development of the Individual Education Plan and implementation of this plan. The local school district is responsible for the delivery of services required by the IEP and if public schools cannot provide, then services must be purchased through outside sources. Similar federal legislation, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, or Public Law 94-142 was passed in 1975.

Child Study Team (CST): A building-based team of educators who meet on a regular basis to review student progress or problems and to suggest modifications and intervention strategies. If the suggested strategies and modifications have not helped the student, this

team then recommends the student be referred to special education for evaluation.

Education of All Handicapped Children Act: also known as Federal law P.L. 94-142 mandates rights similar to those specified in Chapter 766. Amended in 1986 and October 1990 with a change of name to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Generic Model: Special Education Instruction occurs within the regular education classes from a Team Teaching approach to tutorial assistance within a normal class setting.

Handicapped Children's Protection Act: amends the EAHCA effective August 1986. Also know as the "Attorney Fee's Bill", authorizes the awarding or recovery of attorney fees in any hearing or court action filed after July 3, 1984. A parent/guardian may recover attorney's fees if the prevailing party in a decision. Prevailing means any change in plan from the original IEP presented by schools.

IDEA: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: amends the EAHCA to include autism and traumatic brain injury as separate categories for eligibility and reporting under Part B, bringing the number of categories of disability in the federal laws and

regulations up to 13. The final law strikes all references to ADD (Attention Deficit Disorder) maintaining that these children are already eligible for and receiving special education and related services under the learning disability and serious emotional disturbance (SED) categories. As noted, the law changes the name of the Act and it also replaces the word "handicap" whenever it appears with the word "disability". This change was effected in order to move away from terminology that focuses on a condition, rather than a person.

IEP: Individual Education Plan

Individual Education Plan: The plan conjointly developed by the Special Education Team specifying the special needs of the child, short and long term goals and appropriate services required to meet these goals. The goals must be stated in measurable objectives, stated in behavioral terms, so the child's progress can be evaluated semi-annually.

Integrated Special Education Classes: classes that are almost equal in numbers of special education students and non-special education students; i.e., 49% sped and 51% non-sped.

LRE: Least Restrictive Environment

Least Restrictive Environment: Chapter 766 regulations define LRE as "the program that, to the maximum extent appropriate, allows a child to be educated with children who are not in need of special education". Public Law 94-142, the Federal equivalent of Chapter 766, is more explicit:

> to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, handicapped children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that the education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aid and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.(P.L.94-142)

Mainstreaming: or "integration" of the child with non special-needs peers in a least restrictive setting; i.e., regular classroom.

Maximum potential: or maximum extent possible: This standard was re-emphasized through the David D. Vs. Dartmouth decision of 1985. It supplants the term <u>"adequate and appropriate"</u> which had been the standard in conjunction with "<u>least restrictive environment</u>" most often used by special education administrators in public schools to determine a special education placement.

Mediation: An optional process at local and state level to resolve differences between school and parent.

State level mediators are available to participate at request of either party.

P.L. 94-142: Public Law 94-142 (see Education for All Handicapped Children Act).

Prereferral Intervention: Collaborative consultation between regular and special education staff to define problems and strategies to assist classroom teachers before the initiation of a formal referral for special education evaluation.

Program Prototype: Chapter 766 eliminated the use of diagnostic labels and assigned children by the proportion of weekly time spent in special education services: (see Appendix A for a more detailed description of 502.1 to 502.11 prototypes).

REI: Regular Education Initiative, a strategy to unify regular and special education as proposed by Madeline Will in 1986; U. S. Department of Education.

Resource Programs: Generally an educational support service provided by a resource teacher or specialist outside the regular/mainstream class; hence, often referred to as "pull-out- programs".

Resource/Consulting Teacher (R/CT): An integrative model combining direct resource services and indirect consultation to classroom teachers.

Reverse Mainstream Classes: When the ratio of special needs students is three to one; i.e., Early childhood prototype 502.8C preschool classes may have a total of nine students, six with special needs, and three with no special needs. The purpose of the configuration is to provide intense remediation for the handicapped students with appropriate role models who will become more tolerant of differences and enhance the true meaning of "integration".

State Advisory Commission (SAC): A group of educational professionals and concerned citizens, with representation from the six education regions of the state. Parents may appeal an adverse decision to this body for review.

Teacher Assistance Teams (TAT): A school-based problem-solving unit used to assist teachers in generating intervention strategies.

Team Evaluation: Replaces term "Core Evaluation". Consists of professional members charged with evaluating a child's need for special services.

Members submit reports in written form to chairperson for presentation at a Team Meeting.

Team Meeting: Parents and evaluators convene to review results of evaluations/assessments and determine a child's special need and areas of strength; this information is the basis for the Team to develop an Individual Education Plan.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The findings of this study are limited to the four communities studied. The findings of the study cannot be generalized beyond the specified areas of research. Subjects of the study are limited to the public school administrators and teachers within the specified four communities.

The research is subjective and descriptive. It presents the experience and perceptions of a selected group of school administrators and teachers from four North-of-Boston communities as to how each has viewed the implementation of the special education mandates. It is, therefore, limited in its generalizability.

ENDNOTES CHAPTER I

[1] Maynard C Reynolds, (1989), An historical perspective: The delivery of special education to mildly disabled and at-risk students, RASE,10(6),p 7.

[2] Bonnie S. Hausman,(1985), Mandates without money: Negotiated enforcement of special education regulations (retrenchment, bargaining) (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 46/07-A 2060.

[3] David D., etc. v. Dartmouth School Committee, 775 F 2d 411 (MASS Cir.1985)

[4] Judith D. Singer, J. Butler, S. Palfrey, D. K. Walker,(1986), Characteristics of special education placements: Findings from probability samples in five metropolitan school districts, Journal of Special Education, 20(3) p 319-337.

[5] Judith D. Singer et al. (1986)

[6] Mark Bloom & Frank Garfunkel,(1981), Least restrictive environments and parent-child rights: A paradox, Urban Education 15(4) p 379-401

[6] Milton Budoff & Alan Orenstein, Due process in special education: On going to a hearing, (Cambridge: MA, Brookline Books, 1982)

[6] John Malloy,(1980), The role of the administrator of special education in implementing comprehensive special education mandates, (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston College)

[6] James B. Earley,(1985), A study to determine whether the special education administrative model enhances the integration of special needs students into regular education, (Ed.D dissertation, University of Massachusetts) Dissertation Abstracts International, 46/03-A p 564.

[6] Bonnie S. Hausman (1985)p.307.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Initial Studies and Early Trends

Since the implementation of Chapter 766 in Massachusetts and Federal Public Law 94-142, public schools have been required to provide an appropriate and free education for all special needs students from age 3 years to 22 years, in the least restrictive setting which will insure a students development to the maximum extent appropriate (Chap 766 p.3,p.54).[7] The Federal law is even more explicit about integration of the student with handicaps into the regular education setting:

> ...to assure that, to the maximum extent possible,.. handicapped children are educated with children who are not handicapped... and that removal from the regular education environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that the education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.(PL 94-142) [8]

This language was added to the Massachusetts special education law in September of 1986, following the court decision in the David D. v. Dartmouth case.

Guidelines and criteria established by law have been refined via the Special Education Appeals Process and subsequent court decisions. The law intended to

insure parents of due process and full participation in educational matters. Chapter 766 assigned to Massachusetts public schools the responsibility of coordinating a comprehensive plan of social, psychological, and educational services for students with handicaps.

Chapter 766 and Public Law 94-142 have changed the course of education in America. They are the only legislative acts that mandate quality and equal education for the student with handicaps. The literature has covered the history of development through legislative passage and educational implementation. McGarry and Finan (1982) coordinated an extensive two year study relative to Massachusetts special education law. These included ten substudies of issues related to implementation of the law, conducted by the Huron Institute. Overall, the studies found a generally favorable response to education for the handicapped from a majority of citizens. However, primary areas of concern were the lack of funding for mandated services (p.3)[9], the variability of interpretation of "least restrictive environment" from one community to the next (p.35)[10], and ..." local resentment of the involvement of a state agency in the

affairs of school districts accustomed to local control of education" (p.43).[11]

Gerald Tindall, Gary Germann, Douglas Marston and Stanley Deno conducted an experimental study on the assessment, decision making and intervention process as it relates to Learning Disabled students(1983). During 1980 to 1983 this research focused on four major areas: (1) referral,(2) identification,(3) intervention planning and progress and process/evaluation, (4) outcome of evaluation. Six school districts, all members of an educational collaborative, participated in this study. Ninety five students, grade one through six were assessed three times per academic year on direct curriculum based measures of achievement in reading, math and spelling. Analyses of student performance data across the entire six districts was completed for each district, by teacher and finally by classification, grade and sex. Comparable testing was administered to a randomly selected group of regular education students. Six-hundred and sixty students were tested, twenty from each grade in each district. Two indices of performance were calculated: (1) absolute score in reading, math and spelling and (2) the degree of improvement relative to regular education performance. Materials for measurement were taken

from the work of Deno and Mirkin, evaluative instructional programs. Emphasis was on direct and frequent assessment of student progress. This study conducted a meta-analyses of effect sizes of available data in an attempt to find objective and relevant trends. Previous research had used norm referenced tests to measure student learning. Findings have been inconclusive. However the validity of the investigators method of measurement may require further application to determine reliability. Results of this study indicated four trends emerging: (1) students receiving service improved to performance levels closer to those attained by regular education students, (2) child learning can be assessed without norm reference tests, (3) direct measurement data may also be used in a norm reference fashion such as with peer discrepancy scores, (4) previous research (50 studies) of measurement of student achievement found special education students overall did not improve performance or findings were inconclusive. Further analysis of these studies indicated differential effects for various categories of exceptionality; learning disabled and behavior disordered students surpassed in achievement those categorized as educable mentally retarded and slow learners. Tindall et al. concluded that the alternative system of measurement utilizing a

data based assessment model as opposed to rating scales or published tests, was a more sensitive system of measurement and a more true indication of the effects of special education services (p 1-72).[12]

The elimination of labels or categories opened the doors of eligibility for special services in Massachusetts education. Milton Budoff projected the change to occur in education in his article printed in the Harvard Educational Review in 1975.

> The law specifically abjures the use of categorical labels that stigmatize children. In the past such labels were all the diagnostic process yielded. In contrast, Chapter 766 requires that a multi-discipline Core Evaluation Team assess each child's special needs and then prepare an appropriate individual educational plan. Along with instructional services, like tutoring in reading, a plan may include counselling, physical therapy, or psychotherapy for the child and/or his parents.(p.507)[13]

> ...The law takes the radical step of dealing with all children in actual or potential educational risk. Thus if a child is in danger at midyear of not being promoted, or indeed fails, he or she can be referred for services. Similarly, four other groups might be referred: students suspended for more than five days in a quarter; those absent more than 15 days in a quarter without medical excuse; those who demonstrate distinct learning or behavior changes after an illness; those considered delinquent.(p.526)[14]

Initial studies conducted as to the effectiveness of the law in improving the quality of education to the student with handicaps and the right of due process to parents were generally positive (McGarry,Finan 1982.

Tindall, Germann, Marston, & Deno 1983). The resistance to change and clarification of the intent of the law were focused in the appeals process, and initially studied by Budoff and Orenstein with a preferred focus on parental perspective; Bloom and Garfunkel viewing the process from the perspective of the educator.

Diana O. Bander conducted a study of the events that led up to the enactment of Chapter 766 in Massachusetts. Her dissertation research, completed in 1982 at Harvard University, provided a historical perspective which described and analyzed the major legal, political, economic and social factors influencing special education policy in Massachusetts between 1965 and 1978. Her study assesses the contributions of three central influences on the shape of educational policy: 1) special interest groups and citizen advocacy, 2) the use of litigation as an instrument of social reform, and 3) the political, social, and economic context in which this educational policy evolved. Many of the same inconsistent and fiscally underfunded policies which gave impetus to the reform have been cited as weakness in the law creating problems for school committees and parents fifteen years after the implementation of the law (p.2-7).[15]

Effects of Litigation and Appeals

Budoff and Orenstein (1982) conducted a comprehensive study of the Appeals Process in Massachusetts which insures procedural safeguards for parents and students. This process became the forum for resolution of individual cases and ultimately the standard bearer for interpretation of the law. Mark Blum and Frank Garfunkel (1981) also took a look at the appeals process in relation to the term least restrictive environment and parent-child rights. Their research found conflict in the decisions rendered by the Bureau of Appeals during the first five years of Chapter 766. The original intent of the law was to guarantee parents "due process" to force public schools to develop programs in neighborhood/local schools for students with disabilities to avoid the residential or long distance/transport placement(p.380).[16] Initial appeals decisions, or at least one half of those rendered, decided in favor of the parent's request for a more restrictive setting, in a private special education facility, out of the mainstream, and at some distance from the child's neighborhood and local school(p.382).[17]

The dilemma for parents, schools and the appeals bureau was that school systems did not have

"experienced" programs or staff prepared to provide "quality" education for students with handicaps relative to the "quality" and experience of the Chapter 750 programs already existing to serve the handicapped student. Parents, for the most part, were not willing to wait or to allow their children to be the experimental guinea pigs, to risk loss of appropriate and adequate service, while school systems developed programs and hired or trained staff (Bloom, Garfunkel, 1981, Budoff & Orenstein 1982, McGarry & Finan, 1982).

Prior to Chapter 766, Chapter 750 transferred fiscal and educational responsibility for "emotionally disturbed" children from the local community to the state. Under 750, parents applied for eligibility certification. When this was granted, the state assumed responsibility for tuition and transportation costs, payable directly to the private day or residential schools. , This program created an incentive for communities to allow children with handicaps to be placed outside of the local school district in order to be relieved of financial and social responsibility for these students (Bloom & Garfunkel, 1981, p.385).[18] This resulted in local school systems deferring educational and social responsibility to the state.

The Appeals process has been the forum for resolution of individual cases between school systems and parents/guardians. The Appeals decisions have been a major catalyst for program change and development within public schools (Kirp et al.,1975, Bloom, 1979, Budoff & Orenstein, 1982, Garfunkel, 1981, Haynes, 1982, McGarry,Finan, 1982, Apgar, 1988, Osborne, 1989). For example, The Board of Education vs. Rowley, decided in 1982 that a deaf child who was doing very well in regular education classes was not entitled to a sign language interpreter. However the decision re-emphasized the principles of the Federal Law: individualized plans and involvement of the parents as decision-makers in the process. In 1984, the Supreme Court ruled, in TATRO vs.TEXAS that catheterization was an educational service (Murphy, Lamere & Murphy, 1986, Vaughn & Shearer 1986, Kervick 1987). This decision clarified the entitlement of ancillary services in relation to the educational progress of a student. "In addition to tuition costs, the courts have been unanimous in finding that the costs of related services are also reimbursable" (Osborne, 1989,p.58).[19] The David D vs. Dartmouth decision highlighted the intent of Chapter 766: To provide a free, appropriate education which would insure a

students development to the maximum potential of ability (Apgar 1986, Murphy et.al, 1986).

Robert C. O'Reilly and Mary Sayler in their article Handicapped Children in Schools: Administrators and the Courts (1985) document through five landmark legal cases the crucial role performed by school principals in discharging a school system's legal obligations toward the handicapped.

> The central role played by principals in revealing IEP's (Individual Education Plans) to the parents/guardians of a handicapped child is a tremendously important aspect of the obligation for educating all children. That role comes after identification, consultation, staffing and planning. When it creates controversy or when it is rejected, the principal's role is raised to a next level of intensity, for reconsideration then becomes a must. Out of the many critical roles that a principal must play, the interface/presentation of an IEP to parents is surely one of the most critical. Whether delegated or done personally, neither procedure diminishes the criticalness of that presentation. (p.4a)[20]

> In most cases that involve disputed placement of handicapped children, it is fair to assume that every principal had a voice before the presentation of the IEP was made and before the parental objection arose. As the administrator with responsibility for the building, the principal is entitled legally to a voice in every IEP. This doesn't mean that every IEP staffing must include a principal, but it does mean that could be the case. Placement of children is the principals's responsibility and the IEP must stand examination for the educational quality. (p. 4b)[21]

The authors review the litigation and court decisions which have more clearly defined the intent of the special education law and the role of the gatekeepers, special education administrators, and their co-respondents, building principals.

> Although the programmatic responsibilities are, in this grouping of statutes and cases, clearly the obligation of each school system, it is equally clear that building administrators are operationally responsible. Principals must facilitate identification, create any conditions necessary for a staffing, and signal their endorsement of the Iep's. Most essential in the entire operation for every building principal is to control special education programs to the extent that adequate due process be made available to each child and parent. That is a critical legal minimum for every principal(p.19).[22]

Special education requires individualized instruction in a one on one, small group, or regular class setting based on the needs of a student as determined in Massachusetts by a multi-disciplined evaluation (Chapter 766). An educational plan is developed based on the assessments provided by the Team. Long term goals with measurable objectives stated in behavioral terms, along with methods of instruction and reporting must be included on this plan for parent approval.

Per Pupil Costs: Mandates Without Money

An article contributed by Adrian Walker in the March 11, 1990 Boston Globe notes that many school districts are "wrangling with expense of special-needs programs. State aid has been drastically cut to cities and towns" (p.25).[23] "Budgets for special needs programs have increased as much as 20 percent a year in some communities. The largest part of that expense goes to residential care which can cost up to $100,000. a year per student" (p.25b).[24] Consolidating programs and finding less expensive ways to provide services is a common goal for all school districts in Massachusetts. Sixteen percent of the state's students are enrolled in special education programs "which is believed to be the highest in the nation" (p.26).[25] Walker interviewed an assistant superintendent, a director of special education and the Department of Education Associate Commissioner, along with the Director of the Federation for Children with Special Needs, also a parent of an autistic child.

The Assistant Superintendent brought back three out of district students to mainstreamed classes with a special aide, reducing costs by 50%. The Director of Special Education in Watertown stated that school officials regularly feel the heat from parents who

believe that too much money is spent for special education. The Massachusetts special education mandate was purposely designed to include rather than exclude children. Advocates for special needs students say that the vagueness was deliberate. This policy has led to the "largest special-needs program in the nation"(p.26).[26] Mary Beth Fafard, the DOE Associate Commissioner reported that..."the state's average expenditure per special needs pupil is roughly triple that for students in traditional programs" (p.26).[27] Currently the state of Massachusetts spends more than $ 8,000. per pupil for special needs students as opposed to slightly more than $ 3,000. per pupil for non-special needs students.

In the 1977-78 school year in Massachusetts, there were 124,754 special needs students from a total student population of 1,395,991 or 8.93 %. The per pupil costs for the same fiscal year were:

Total Per pupil cost = $1,393.
Non-special education students cost = 1,261.
Special education student cost= 4,915.

Ten years later the total number of special needs students in Massachusetts were 135,411, from a total of 1,109.068 or 12.21 %. The per pupil cost for the year

1987 was recorded by the Department of Education as follows:

Total per pupil cost = $2,938.
Non special education student cost= 2,569.
Special education student cost=8,796.

This data was compiled from the end-of-the-year reports submitted by each school district within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Department of Education, DOE 1988,p.7).[28]

Chapter 766 was enacted in 1972 and implemented in 1974 in Massachusetts; a grassroots initiative with a growing constituency of citizens, legislators and judicial activists of the commonwealth . The law was designed and enacted during a period of social activism and reform. The implementation of this policy during the late 70's and '80's is characterized by turbulence and controversy as the political climate became increasingly conservative.

During the conservative '80's Massachusetts special education regulations required schools to provide a vast array of services not traditionally within the realm of public education while under the constraints of Proposition 2 1/2. This citizen's initiative, capped the percent of taxes to be

raised, therefore limiting spending and local jurisdiction over school budgets. There is a direct correlation to the development of the 2 1/2 tax cap and Chapter 766.

Bonnie Hausman (1985) conducted a comparative case study of the responses of two school districts, Boston and Manville, to MANDATES WITHOUT MONEY: Special Education Regulations; for dissertation research at Brandeis University. Her research found that school official's responses evolved in three stages: 1) resistance, 2) preoccupied with other priorities;compliance not a focus, 3) renegotiate terms of compliance with regulatory agency DOE.; and the final stage to regulatory enforcement.

Hausman's study concludes that regulatory intervention has become counter-productive. Enforcement of special education regulations, if rigorously pursued, will severely threaten the viability of public education. She found that regulation dispersed the power base which complicated governance and harnessed professional discretion (p.319-323).[29]

Hausman's research indicated that Special Education reform created among parents a view that all children's needs should be addressed individually.

> Indeed, advocates for handicapped children promote an expansion of PL94-142 to include all children....These parents like the parents of non-handicapped children, adopt a similar obsession with excellence; they insist that their child be exposed to the best and most advanced techniques available. Given their sophistication, the technology-forcing implications of their concern for excellence squeezes the education budget further and escalates the competition for scarce resources. It was to a great extent, the escalation of this conflict within school districts that produced the widespread citizen pressure to set limits on revenues through tax-reduction schemes such as Proposition 2 1/2. (p.307)[30]

Hausman's study viewed two system's responses to regulation and included reactions of teachers and administrators to special education.

Least Restrictive Environment: The Mainstream Debate

A study conducted by the Massachusetts Advocacy Center, published in May of 1987, indicates that the spirit of the law has been violated by Massachusetts public schools in the area of "mainstreaming handicapped students." Data collected indicates that the handicapped student has become more segregated with an increase in more restrictive placements(p.19).[31] The Department of Education published a fact paper in March 1988, which confirms the swing from more

restrictive out-of-district placements initially to less restrictive, or self contained classes located within public schools. Although public school enrollments have declined, the numbers of special education students has increased (Department of Education,1988,p.8).[32]

In 1986 Madeleine Will, Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services of the U. S. Department of Education proposed THE REGULAR EDUCATION INITIATIVE (REI), a strategy for unifying regular and special education. Will called for a fundamentally restructured mainstream adjusted to the needs of students with handicaps. She cites several "obstacles" which have ..."produced unintended effects, some of which make it unnecessarily cumbersome for educators to teach-as effectively as they desire and children to learn, as much and as well as they can"(p.6).[33] Will notes the following obstacles:

1. fragmented approach; i.e, pull-out and separate specialists from regular classroom.

2. the dual system: separate administrative arrangements contribute to lack of coordination, leadership, responsibility and accountability within schools.

> Most school administrators take the view that responsibility for students with learning problems belongs to special education or other special programs. These programs are usually the responsibility of the central office of the school district, but are delivered at the building level. This means that building principals do not develop ownership of the programs' educational goals. Nor are building principals always authorized or disposed to ensure the consistent high quality of special programs. As a result, principals may not be able to use their influence to set the high expectations and standards for students with learning problems nor encourage teachers to "go the extra mile" for these children. Hence the impact of these programs is lessened. (p.8)[34]

3. Stigmatization of the students: may further isolate students with handicaps from their peers, resulting in poor self-esteem and negative attitudes toward school and learning. Stigma of <u>special</u> or <u>handicapped</u> can result in negative staff attitudes.

4. Placement decision as battleground: adversarial relationships between parents and school; failure to view each other with parity and as partners in the process.

Will also cites obstacles existing in regular classrooms which impede learning and reveal a need for "multi-pronged strategies to assist all students with learning needs" (p.12).[35]

> These include a lock-step grade system which is based on the assumption that all students learn the same skills ...within the same period. The "golden mean" assumption of public instruction which says that if a 6th grade class has children whose reading proficiency spans the 3rd to 9th

> grades, then the reading material should be targeted to the 6th grade level.(p.13)[36]

Additionally, there is an imposed pressure on teachers to teach a prescribed curriculum without adequate time to prepare and plan to meet the unique needs of individual students. Lack of support and training for regular education instructors combined with the constraints imposed on principals by administrative rules and regulations which prevent classrooms teachers from getting the support they need to help students in their classrooms all combine to impede good teaching and potential learning.

Effective educational change starts at the building level. "The building principal is the school's educational leader and the catalyst for change" (p.16a).[37] As Margaret Wang and Nancy Zollers state in their recent article on Adaptive Instruction:

> The literature on school change is consistently clear about the importance of the instructional leadership role played by building principals and the administrative support they provide in initiating and maintaining the implementation of innovative school improvement programs.... The principal assumes increased responsibility and accountability for identifying and providing resource support, facilitating program implementation, providing staff development to ensure a high degree of program implementation and effects, and providing information on programmatic changes to groups of

> stakeholders such as parents and school district administrators.(Wang & Zollers 1990, p.10) [38]

Will calls for an experimental approach to change, utilizing existing resources and, within the parameters of the law, providing teachers with more support in the classrooms, establishing programs at the building level, empowering principals to control all programs and resources, adopting an early intervention model which would identify and remediate before the student develops a severe education problem (M.Will 1986 p.16b).[39]

Proponents of the REI contend that this would lead to better education for all children at lower cost (Reynolds, 1985, Haynes & Jenkins,1988, Wang 1984-89, Walberg,1987). Those opposed to this initiative argue for more time to study the effects of special education law. Adjusting the mainstream, REI critics warn, could be a greater problem, saving money only by reducing the quality of services for children with handicaps (Kauffman & Puller 1989, Singer,1988). Both camps agree that mainstreaming is the goal but differ greatly as to the method and timing. The research on the efficacy of special education is incomplete. The majority of studies comparing special education classes to regular education occurred prior to or immediately following the implementation of Massachusetts Chapter

766 and Federal Public Law 94-142. The complexity of both regular and special education classes has changed within these ten years(Harvard Graduate School of Education -Education Letter 1989 p.1-5).[40]

Maynard Reynolds (1989) cites failure of special educators to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource room or pull-out model, the unreliable methods used to classify and place students, (Ysseldyke et al.1983, Singer et al 1986), a steady increase in the numbers of students at-risk-for-failure (Hodgkinson, 1985) and the high cost of diagnostic procedures (Moore, Strong, Schwartz & Braddock,1988) which supports the movement toward the Regular Education Initiative (p.9).[41] He supports experimental programs, flexible interpretation of the waiver of some rules and regulations which will allow cross-categorical teaching to permit service to children with handicaps in mainstream settings. Reynolds also advocates the increased use of curriculum-based assessment (CBA) in child study to curtail use of Intelligence Testing, projective psychological processes and neurological "insults" which he claims, are next to useless in improving instruction (p.10).[42]

One might say that there is a tendency among special educators and school psychologists to try

> to put new wine (operating in accord with new policies) in old bottles (old predictive schemes and rejection processes). What is required today is a more complex decision framework that considers program differences and individual differences simultaneously (an ATI or aptitude-treatment-interaction approach).(p.8)[43]

James Kauffman and Patricia Pullen (1989) have a more restrained approach advocating maintenance and repair of familiar service delivery structures. They argue that "Direct instruction and behavioral interventions are probably the most effective classroom strategies for most mildly handicapped and at-risk students"(p.12).[44] (Gersten et al.,1987, Lloyd et al.,1988) "In our view, preservation of service delivery options ranging from fully integrated education to education in separate classes and schools is necessary for achieving and maintaining appropriate education for all students" (p.13).[45]

Resource programs, generally have provided service to students within the public schools by "pulling-out" the student from regular education classes to receive individualized or small group instruction in a separate setting. Wiederholt and Chamberlain (1989) identify five types of resource programs currently operating in schools: categorical, cross-categorical, noncategorical, specific skill varieties and itinerant(p.16).[46] This model approach includes

assessment, teaching and consulting services. Wiederholt and Chamberlain reviewed thirty seven studies examining the efficacy of resource programs, analyzed different types of resource programs and reviewed the ethical considerations regarding pull-out programs.

> In sum, the critics of resource programs may be correct in stating that these pull-out programs have failed in many instances to meet the needs of students assigned to these settings, however, the fault may not be with the model itself. Instead, the fault may lie in the fact that these programs are still evolving. Once defined and refined, these programs may well serve as one viable delivery system within the schools for students who are handicapped and those who are at risk for school failure. (p.25)[47]

The Resource/Consulting Teacher (R/CT) model provides two types of service for the student with mild academic and/or behavior problems. As designed and developed by Lorna Idol, in collaboration with Joseph Jenkins and M. Stephen Lilly and others at the University of Illinois during the years 1978 to 1986, the Resource/Consulting Teacher (R/CT) provides direct service in the resource room or similar setting and indirect and consultative support for a portion of the professional day to general classroom teachers who teach special needs students. Direct services include curriculum -based assessment; direct instruction; monitor of student progress via data-based instruction; criterion- referenced, mastery learning approaches to

teaching; adherence to stages of learning development; and use of principles of applied behavior analysis when identifying student problems and planning instructional programs. The consultation is based on a collaborative model for problem solving. Idol's field based evaluations in Illinois and California found that teachers in this model were able to effect system changes working closely with administrators in planning and role direction; developed a camaraderie among training R/CTs which led to a deeper commitment to collaboration. Problems for further study involve the time constraints and the variability of student needs (p.39-45).[48]

Teacher Assistance Teams or Teacher Support Teams have become more prevalent during the past ten years and James C. Chalfant and Margaret Van Dusen Pych (1989) have compiled data reflecting the experience of 96 school-based teams during their first year of implementation. Like other alternative methods, these teams evolved as a result of school system concerns regarding over-referral rates, misclassification of students, rising costs, and the need to maximize opportunities for all students in the least restrictive environment (p.49).[49] The teacher assistance team (TAT) is a school-based problem-solving unit used to

assist teachers in generating intervention strategies. A team usually consists of a core of three elected faculty members representing various grade levels of disciplines who assist other teachers. The classroom teacher requesting assistance serves as a fourth and equal member of the team. Team membership may vary by building and specific teacher need. Some teams include special education staff, principals and parents (p.50).[50]

Chalfant and Van Dusen Psych make six major recommendations for improving team effectiveness: administrative support, faculty support, training, team procedures, networking, and evaluation(p.56a).[51]

> Team members perceived their school-based teams to be effective because of three factors: principal support, teacher support, and the professional and interpersonal skills of team members. When these factors were absent, teams were perceived by team members as ineffective. Teachers ordinarily have few forums to share their problems in a professional way and brainstorm solutions with one another. Building-level teams provide a forum where teachers, like physicians, can consult with one another, share their expertise, and benefit from one another's experience and areas of specialty. (p.56b)[52]

Margaret Wang and Nancy Zollers (1990) have developed and studied the Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM) as an alternative service delivery approach for serving students with special needs in regular classrooms. This model is based on

the premise that students learn in different ways and at different rates. Curriculum incorporates a variety of materials and learning activities designed for both "teacher-prescribed and student-initiated learning activities in various subject-matter content areas" (p.8).[53] Effective instruction utilizes all forms of good classroom practice to accommodate diverse learners. Wang and Zollers advocate functional and cooperative linkages between general and special educators. Using the ALEM approach, general education teachers would serve all students in the general or regular classroom setting with coordinated support from all other specialists. The role of the special educator and other specialists would be redefined to assess student learning needs, collaborate with instructional staff to develop strategies that improve student's motivation and acquisition of basic skills, to work intensively with individual or small groups of students when most needed, and to serve as a link to community resources. Organizationally, the ALEM approach would require..." flexible scheduling, alternative arrangement of space and the instructional leadership of building principals"(p.9).[54] Wang and Zollers cite several studies which have successfully implemented the ALEM approach to produce positive changes in classroom processes and student learning

outcomes (Wang & Birch,1984; Wang, Nojan, Strom, & Walberg,1984; Wang, Peverly, & Randolph, 1984; Wang, Rubenstein & Reynolds 1985; Wang & Walberg, 1983). These changes include increases in student-teacher interactions for instructional purposes and concomitant decreases in management-related interactions; increases in time spent on-task, decreases in student's disruptive behaviors and increases in student-initiated learning activities (p.15).[55] Achievement test scores for ALEM regular and special needs students are comparable to national and population norms. Several ALEM schools in Brooklyn reported general ALEM students made an average gain of 1.87 in math and 1.19 in reading where the national norm is 1.00. ALEM mainstreamed students with special needs produced mean gains of 1.08 in math and 1.04 in reading. This is significant when compared to achievement gains of similar special needs students in self-contained programs which averaged a gain of less than 6 months (p.15-16).[56]

Collaborative Consultation is described as a professional interactive problem-solving process, as well as a service delivery option for educating mildly handicapped and at-risk students by researchers J. Frederick West and Lorna Idol. In a recently published

article West and Idol (1990) explain how this model can be used to build a more effective interface between general education and special education incorporated into any of the service delivery options available to educators today. They also note the difference between collaborative consultation and cooperation which bears repeating: cooperation is a term that assumes two or more parties, separate and autonomous, agree to work together to achieve their separate goals for a similar but separate cause. Collaboration is a term that implies shared responsibility and authority for basic policy decision making (p.23-24).[57] West and Idol cite figures from the Department of Education Special Education Cost Study for the 1985-1986 school year reporting that 5% of all the nation's students are assessed under special education and these assessment services account for 12 cents of each dollar spent for special education or about $ 2 billion per year or $1,273 per assessment (p.22a).[58] They suggest collaborative consultation as an alternative to the "refer-test-place paradigm" (p.22b).[59] Effective schools literature as reviewed by Purkey and Smith (1985) conclude that two of the variables consistently present in effective schools are collaborative planning and collegial relationships. Results of a 1989 survey of members of the Council for Exceptional Children

ranked collaborating with regular education teachers and teachers in other special programs as a top priority in professional developmental (p.23).[60]

School cultures and obstacles to change.

Byrd Jones and Robert Maloy in their recent book Partnerships for Improving Schools (1988) record and analyze the experience of collaboration and effective change for school improvement, following seven projects linking public schools with business and higher education as partners. Using cross-case analysis that is both explanatory and exploratory, following R. K Yin's recommendations for empirical investigation of "... a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (Yin 1984, p.23).[61] These authors have asked how and why partnerships have evolved and how they have overcome barriers to school improvement. Jones and Maloy believe that improvement involves a change in school cultures (p.16).[62]

> Public schools in the United States resemble closed systems or self-perpetuating cultures that will be less and less functional for future societies. School improvement must involve sustained efforts by educators to involve new resources and to introduce different behaviors into school settings. (p.17).[63]
>
> Ultimately, we assert that if schools and outside organizations work together over time,

> they will gain fresh perspectives, redefine the nature of their partnership, and reflect on the purposes of educational reforms. Accordingly, we define collaborative "success" or "effectiveness" as changing teacher attitudes and/or school behaviors through group processes that share power and enhance the equity of outcomes.(p.18)[64]

This perspective aligns with many of the recommendations delivered for school improvement by the Carnegie Forum , 1986; Darling-Hammond, 1988; and the Holmes Group, 1986. A common theme running through much of the literature regarding school reform emphasizes the decentralization of special education service delivery, a stronger collaboration between regular/general education and special education, and school based management which allows the individuals or groups responsible for providing the service to make the decisions related to all aspects of management.

> School based management is based on two fundamental beliefs: (a) those most closely affected by decisions ought to play a significant role in making those decisions and (b) educational reform efforts will be most effective and long-lasting when carried out by people who feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for the process. (AASA/NAESP/NASSP School Based Management Task Force,1988,pp.5-6)[65]

Jones and Maloy recognize and identify obstacles which exist to improving schools. The structure of the school itself, the administration, the instructional staff and support staff all operate in isolation of each other(Cohen, 1983). On the surface it appears as if there is a plan and someone is in charge. "School

teachers have not developed a firm knowledge base of a sense of autonomy and status that might clarify their complex roles" (Jones & Maloy p.25a).[66] Teachers do not regard themselves as professional. Working conditions are dictated by a need for order and safety for students who are mandated to attend schools. Teachers are accorded an ambiguous respect directed toward guardians of the young (p.25b).[67]

James B. Earley, undertook a study to determine whether the special education administrative model enhances the integration of special needs students into regular education. His dissertation completed at the University of Massachusetts in 1985, took a look at three existing models all of which were in existence prior to and following the enactment of the law.

Model I -Pupil Personnel Services

Model II-Special Education Services

Model III-Special Services.

Earley found consistency in demographic characteristics throughout the three models with one exception: the ratio of special needs students in those school systems utilizing Model III. It was substantially below the state-wide ratio and the ratio of systems using Model I and Model II. Special education administrators

surveyed were most partial to their model, not willing to change to another model, and felt their admnistrative choice enhanced the integration of special and regular education students. The Special Services Model incorporated all services to students in systems; Chapter I, Remedial Reading, Speech and Language, Counseling along with Special Education. Earley's survey indicates that this model allowed for more school based discretion and flexibility in providing students with quality service (Earley, 1985).[68]

The Massachusetts Advocacy Center conducted a study relative to the least restrictive environment and mainstreaming in 1986. The findings of this study confirm the violation of the intent of Chapter 766 and P.L. 94-142; as does the actual data collected by the regulatory agency, the Department of Education, published in March of 1988. There has been a swing from out-of-district placements 1977-1982, to an increase in public school placements; however in self-contained classes with little or minimal mainstreaming within the public schools.

Howard Knoff (1984) completed a study comparing mainstreaming attitudes and special placement knowledge between New York educators, a categorical labeling

state, and Massachussetts' educators, a non-categorical labeling state. His research addressed the effect of state regulations as an intervening variable. Knoff used the Rucker-Gable Educational Programing Scale (RGEPS). One hundred surveys were sent to each of four independent samples. The RGEPS consists of 30 uncategorized vignettes of actual children referred for special education services and requires the subject to place each child in the most appropriate educational program or setting. Deno's (1970) cascade of services were available to the subjects ranging from least restrictive, a regular classroom; to most restrictive, a residential program. The RGEPS assesses the subjects attitudes toward exceptional children and mainstreaming and knowledge of appropriate education placement. Attitude scores measure the respondent's willingness to move handicapped children closer to the mainstream. Knowledge scores are calculated by comparing the subject's placement with a group of 35 special education experts who also rated the vignettes. The knowledge scores actually reflect the agreement or disagreement with the experts educational placements (Howard Knoff,1984 p.8).[69] Massachusetts teachers, both regular and special educators, were found to be more flexible, open, creative and generally more

supportive of mainstreaming than their counterparts in the labeling state of New York.

Mark Vaughan and Ann Shearer (1986), two British educators, also found teacher and administrator attitudes in a western Massachusetts community were highly supportive of mainstreaming a handicapped student in a public school setting. In their book, they document the experience of a British child, Becci Ingram, a Downs Syndrome child, who spent a year in the Stockbridge Elementary School in the Berkshire Hills District in western Massachusetts, participating in a fully integrated program. Additional examples of mainstreaming are followed at Newton North High School, where a deaf and hearing impaired collaborative is housed. These British educators give great praise to Massachusetts educators for their attempts at mainstreaming. English schools were recently mandated to mainstream children with handicaps (1981 Education Act of the British Isles). The authors report that Roger Brown, Associate Commissioner for Special Education in Massachusetts was visiting schools in England at exactly the same time as authors Vaughan and Shearer were visiting Massachusetts. They report his reaction to the English system:

> We are at least 15 years ahead of you. After my visit here, I'm even more convinced that

> mainstreaming as a philosophy works very, very well. Most children who are in special schools in England would be in our regular public schools--either in special classes for up to 60 percent of their time and regular classes for the rest, or in full time special classes. For instance, I went to a school here for the moderately retarded; there was not a single one who in Massachusetts would not be in one or other of these placements. (Vaughan & Shearer 1986 p. 34)[70]

Summary

When will all educators begin to see the whole picture as a total responsibility? When will educators stop resisting partnerships with parents and community and begin to collaborate? There are systems in Massachusetts that have successfully developed a collaborative relationship with all resources for education

Manville, Newton North, Stockbridge and others, all are smaller more affluent communities who have demonstrated evidence that they are committed to the spirit and letter of the law; least restrictive environment for students with handicaps.

Boston school administrators may be interested but have not been able to make "mainstreaming " a priority. This is a large urban system with a 43 % dropout rate, spending 27.8 % of the municipal budget on schools at an expenditure rate of $ 4,982. per pupil for 1986-87. (Department of Education Census Figures, 1986-87)

There are political and bureaucratic overlays which impede forward movement for integration of special education students. (Hausman 1985)

A very recent study conducted in San Francisco among parents of disabled students revealed that successful integration occurs when administrators and teachers are committed to the concept, involve parents as partners in the total process, and are in frequent communication with all parties involved in the integration of a student with handicaps into the mainstream. (Mary Hanline & Ann Halvorsen 1989)

Since implementation of the Massachusetts and Federal laws mandating special education, more children have been identified and serviced in the least restrictive environment. Whether these services have provided the intervention that maximize a students development is the center of a great and growing debate among professionals. Definition of the term least restrictive environment continues to evolve. Legal decisions have further defined the intention of the law. Fiscal constraints and a more conservative constituency have made implementation difficult and complex.

The first decade and one half have provided rich experience from which to learn and refine educational structures and service delivery. The most prevalent theme for the 1990's will focus on the integration of what has evolved as two educational systems; general/regular education and special education. The essential focus for this change continues to be the child's needs as opposed to the system's needs. The primary players within public education will be the building-based or neighborhood-based principals, teachers and parents, collectively taking full responsibility for all students within their jurisdiction.

Jeptha Greer, Council for Exceptional Children Executive Director, in his commentary printed in the journal of the same name in November of 1989, cautions that educators will need to remain focused on the main issue "...delivering services more effectively to exceptional children" (p.192).[71] He suggests that education reform should put the child first and insist that structure follow function. He poses several questions to be considered in the effort of collaboration:

> 1) what shape must regular ed/special ed linkages take if the child's (not the system's) needs are to drive service delivery?

...2) what kind of strategies should shape cross-institutional collaboration? Do we begin to answer the question from the standpoint of the resources, power, or jurisdictional reach of a given agency, or do we begin building the collaborative effort by identifying the most efficacious point of intervention and who can best accomplish them?
...3) How do we develop continuity of service delivery that is child-rather than system-oriented?...Put the point of delivery as close to the child as possible.
...4) Does the effort have a contractual arrangement between collaborators that deals with both quantitative and qualitative outcomes? Collaboration without accountability is as effective as a diet without a calorie counter; it won't work.(Greer 1989 p.193)[72]

CHAPTER II ENDNOTES

[7] Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, Regulations for the Implementation of Chapter 766 of the Acts of 1972: The Comprehensive Special Education Law (Chapter 766 Regulations) as amended May 22, 1986, to be effective September 1, 1986.(Author) p.3,p.54.

[8] Public Law 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Act, November 29, 1975, amended August 5, 1986 to the Handicapped Children's Protection Act. (Author)

[9] James McGarry and Patricia Leon Finan, Implementing Massachusetts Special Education Law ; A State Wide Assessment, Final Report,(Washington, D.C.: Boston, MA: 1983) p.3.

[10] McGarry & Finan, p.35.

[11] McGarry & Finan, p.43.

[12] Gerald Tindall, G. Germann, D. Marston and S. Deno.(1983) The effectiveness of special education: A Direct measurement approach (Research report # 123) University of Minnesota, Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities, p.1-72.

[13] Milton Budoff, (1975) Engendering change in special education practices, Harvard Educational Review, v 45 p.507.

[14] M. Budoff, (1975) p.526.

[15] Diane O. Bander, (1982) Special education in Massachusetts 1965-1978: A portrait of persistence and change in social policy.(Ed.D. dissertation, Harvard University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 43/06-A, 1921, p.2-7.

[16] Mark Bloom and Frank Garfunkel,(1981) Least restrictive environments and parent-child rights: A Paradox, Urban Education 15, p.380.

[17] Bloom and Garfunkel, (1981) p.382.

[18] Bloom and Garfunkel, (1981) p.385

[19] Allan G. Osborne, Jr., (1989) Reimbursement of private school tuition to parents since Burlington, RASE 10 (5) p.58.

[20] Robert C. O'Reilly and Mary R. Sayler,(1985) Handicapped Children in Schools: Administrators and the Courts. Revised. presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Starkville, MS.(ED 264 639) p. 4a.

[21] O'Reilly and Sayler, (1985) p.4b.

[22] O'Reilly and Sayler, (1985) p.19.

[23] Adrian Walker, (1990, March 11). Schools wrangle with expense of special-needs programs. The Boston Globe, p. 25a.

[24] Adrian Walker, (1990, March 11) Boston Globe p 25b.

[25] A. Walker, (1990, March 11) p. 26a.

[26] A. Walker, (1990, March 11) p. 26b.

[27] A. Walker, (1990, March 11) p. 26c.

[28] The Massachusetts Department of Education, Facts on Special Education in Massachusetts,(Quincy, MA: author, 1988) p. 7.

[29] Bonnie S. Hausman, (1985) Mandates without money: Negotiated enforcement of special education regulations (retrenchment, bargaining)(Ph.D. dissertation Brandeis University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 2060 46/07-A p.319-323.

[30] B. Hausman (1985) p.307.

[31] Julia K. Landau, Massachusetts Advocacy Center, Out of the Mainstream: Education of Disabled Youth In Massachusetts, (Boston: Author 1987) p.19.

[32] The Massachusetts Department of Education, Facts on special Education in Massachusetts, (Quincy, MA: author, 1988) p.8.

[33] Madeleine Will (1986) Educating students with learning problems- a shared responsibility (Report to the Secretary Office of Special Education and

Rehabilitative Services) U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. p.6.

[34] M. Will (1986) p.8.

[35] M. Will (1986) p.12.

[36] M. Will (1986) p.13.

[37] M. Will (1986) p.16a.

[38] Margaret Wang and Nancy Zollers (1990) Adaptive instruction: An alternative service delivery approach. RASE 11 (1), p.10.

[39] M. Will (1986) p.16b.

[40] Staff (1989) The mainstreaming debate.Harvard Graduate School of Education, Education Letter 5 (2) p.1-5.

[41] M. C. Reynolds (1989) An historical perspective: the delivery of special education to mildly disabled and at-risk students. RASE 10 (6) p.9.

[42] M. C. Reynolds (1989) p.10.

[43] M. C. Reynolds (1989) p.8.

[44] James Kauffman and Patricia L. Pullen (1989) An historical perspective: a personal perspective on our history of service to mildly handicapped and at-risk students. RASE 10 (6) p.12.

[45] J. Kauffman & P. Pullen (1989) p.13.

[46] J. Lee Wiederhold and Steven P. Chamberlain (1989) A critical analysis of resource programs. RASE 10 (6) p.16.

[47] J. L. Wiederhold & S. P. Chamberlain (1989) p.16.

[48] Lorna Idol (1989) The resource/ consulting teacher; an integrated model of service delivery. RASE 10 (6) p.39-45.

[49] James C. Chalfant and Margaret Van Dusen Pysh (1989) Teacher assistance teams: five descriptive studies on 96 teams. RASE 10 (6) p. 49.

[50] J. C. Chalfant & M. Van Dusen Pysh (1989) p.50.

[51] J. C. Chalfant & M. Van Dusen Pysh (1989) p.56.

[52] J. C. Chalfant & M. Van Dusen Pysh (1989) p.56.

[53] Margaret C. Wang and Nancy J. Zollers (1990) p.8.

[54] M. Wang & N. Zollers (1990) p.9.

[55] M. Wang & N. Zollers (1990) p.15.

[56] M. Wang & N. Zollers (1990) p.15-16.

[57] J. Frederick West and Lorna Idol (1990) Collaborative consultation in the education of mildly handicapped and at-risk students. RASE 11(1) p.23-24.

[58] J. F. West & L. Idol (1990) p.22a.

[59] J. F. West & L. Idol (1990) p.22b.

[60] J. F. West & L. Idol (1990) p.23.

[61] R.K. Yin, Case Study Research, (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications 1984) p.23.

[62] Byrd L. Jones and Robert W. Maloy, Partnerships for improving schools, (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, Inc. 1988) p. 16.

[63] B. L. Jones & R. W. Maloy (1988) p. 17.

[64] B. L. Jones & R. W. Maloy (1988) p. 18.

[65] AASA/NAESP/NASSP (1988) School-based management: a strategy for better learning. School Based Management Task Force. (Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.) pp.5-6.

[66] B. L. Jones & R. W. Maloy (1988) p.25a.

[67] B. L. Jones & R. W. Maloy (1988) p.25b.

[68] James B. Earley, (1985) A study to determine whether the special education administrative model enhances the integration of special needs students into regular education. (Ed.D dissertation University of Massachusetts) Dissertation Abstracts International,564 46/03-A.(University Microfilms 6335)

[69] Howard Knoff (1984) Mainstreaming attitudes and special placement knowledge in labeling versus nonlabeling states, RASE5 (6) p.8.

[70] Mark Vaughan and Ann Shearer, Mainstreaming in Massachusetts: How special education became ordinary in one state In America, (Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books 1986) p.34.

[71] Jeptha V. Greer (1989) The prime factor in education, Exceptional Children 56 (3) p.192.

[72] J. P. Greer (1989) p.193.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary aim of this research was to record the reactions and experiences of the middle level school managers, special education administrators and building principals, regarding the implementation of special education mandates. Who can better relate the experience of implementing a new standard for all education than those who have traveled the unmarked road? These men and women could be considered pioneers. Their experience, reactions, feelings and opinions have provided perceptions important to the future of special and regular education.

Education scholars are in agreement that the state of research on the efficacy of special education is relatively poor. It is possible to reach widely different conclusions reading the same study. The terms learning disabled, behavior disordered, or mentally retarded are not used consistently and have changed dramatically in meaning since the implementation of the special education law.

A child called mentally retarded in 1976 would not be consistently comparable to the student with a similar profile today (Gerber,1987, Semmel et al,1979, Wang et al.,1988). There is a sense of exaggerated expectation for new programs and theories of learning combined with denial and avoidance when dealing with the hard realities of achieving certain difficult goals in educational circles (Kauffman & Pullen 1989, Jones & Maloy 1988). Research to date neither fully supports or rejects any service delivery model. Resource room, teacher assistance, prereferral, cooperative learning, collaboration, consultation, adaptive learning environments, all have been effective for some students and all have failed for some students. A number of scholars think that a new generation of studies on special education could make a valuable contribution to the state of the art in all education.

Administration of the Special Education mandates has experienced very little review and study as cited in previous chapters. The mandates for administration are open-ended and subject to diverse interpretation, similar to the standards for special education set by law (Appendix B p.161). The exclusive use of quantitative research methods would not truly reflect

the impact of special education regulations on education. It would seem to require a combination of both qualitative and quantitative research to further determine effectiveness of programs, teaching, learning and administrative styles.

This field-based study collected information using descriptive research methods. The four communities participating in this study represent a cross section of the older, more densely populated cities, and newer suburban towns, in the eastern part of Massachusetts from least to most affluent residing within ten miles of each other's borders.

Pilot Study

An initial pilot study survey and interview was conducted with two inner city school administrators (Cambridge, Somerville) and two suburban community administrators (Melrose, Winchester) within the metropolitan Boston area. These communities represented two inner city school districts and two suburban neighboring districts, all geographically located within a ten mile radius from each others borders and each community comparable to the profile of the four North-of Boston Communities (see TABLE 1) selected for the the final research. The results of

this survey yielded validation for the questions used in the final questionnaire and interview.

TABLE 1

North-of-Boston Community Descriptions

Community A = urban-industrialized revitalized city

77,890 = population.

$ 15,300 = average per capita income

40.0% of budget spent on schools.

$ 3,600 per pupil expenditure.

14.6% of students in special education.

17.5% of students in private schools

29% four year drop-out rate.

40% of graduates attend 4 year colleges.

Community B = suburban- former summer community

13,260 = population.

$ 41,230 = average per capita income.

51.8% of budget spent on schools

$ 3,891. per pupil expenditure.

15.8% of students in special education.

7.8% of students attend private schools

6% four year drop-out rate.

63% of graduates attend 4 year colleges.

(continued next page)

TABLE I (cont.)

Community C = urban-former shipping/trading center
population = 38,420
$ 16, 341 = average per capita income
32.3% of budget spent on schools.
$ 3,908. per pupil expenditure.
18.3% of students in special education.
16.1% of students attend private schools
28% four year drop-out rate.
45% of seniors attend 4 year colleges.

Community D = suburban-former summer yachting center
population = 19,390.
$ 52,510 = average per capita income.
38.6% of budget spent on schools.
$ 4,214 per pupil expenditure.
15.1% of students in special education.
15.0% of students attend private schools
3% four year drop-out rate.
75 % of seniors attend 4 year colleges.

Design and Procedure

This author recorded the responses of special and regular education administrators, from these four North-of-Boston communities, two cities with large low income populations and two smaller, more affluent

towns, relative to the evolution and implementation of the special education law, using a combination of descriptive and quantitative research methods; deriving data from multiple choice questionnaire surveys and semi-structured interviews.

This investigation was conducted utilizing a questionnaire and semi-structured interview. The questionnaires were distributed to one special education administrator in each community and two non-special education administrators. One special education and one regular education teacher from the selected communities of study were interviewed to corroborate and balance the information provided by each communities' administrative subjects.

A preliminary letter of request for permission to conduct this research was sent to each Superintendent for review and approval (Appendix C). A personal or phone conference/meeting was scheduled to discuss the process and objectives of this study with each superintendent. Community A, B and D confirmed approval in writing. Community C gave in-person and phone approval.

A letter of transmittal (Appendix D) was forwarded to each selected respondent introducing the

investigator, defining the purpose of the study and providing clear instructions for completing the attached questionnaire.

The questionnaire/survey instrument (Appendix E) focused on four areas:

1. administrative style-self classify from following choices.:authoritarian, collaboration, non-directive, eclectic, other.

2. administrative model (using Early's format)

3. acceptance of special education within system

4. status of mainstreaming or integration of regular and special education.

The results of the questionnaire were tabulated, analyzed and compared. This includes the response rate for each item, total sample size and percentage of responses, as all respondents may not have answered all presented queries. If the questionnaire was not returned within the specified time, a second copy was sent to the selected respondent and a follow-up phone call to ensure it's arrival.

Following administration and receipt of the questionnaires, this investigator conducted

semi-structured audio-taped interviews (Appendix F) with surveyed respondents, special and regular education administrators and teachers from these communities. These interviewees were queried under similar conditions. All but one interview took place at the subject's school in either a classroom or an office. One interview was conducted at a local health club office to accomodate the comfort and schedule of the teacher. The interviews were transcribed by the interviewer or volunteer secretary/typist, as immediately following the interview as was possible.

The transcriptions were read by an objective party familiar with the subject and highly experienced as a clinical researcher, to verify contents and conclusions. Dr. Karen Hosking, a Clinical Psychologist was the objective reader. The audio-tapes were destroyed following Dr. Hosking's review and the transcriptions were made available to any subject requesting same. When all the interviews were completed and transcribed, this researcher read through them and identifled major and minor themes.

The Researcher/Investigator

This investigator's interest in the areas of mainstreaming special and regular education students

and the impact of how school administrators have implemented the regulations evolved through professional experience as a Coordinator of Special Education in a public school system. Through trial and error, frustration, defeat, and occasional triumph, this author has come to respect the effectiveness of good partnerships between school personnel and between schools and parents to successfully promote mainstreaming.

Combining ten years experience as a coordinator/social worker for special education and fourteen years in community mental health as a trained systems family therapist, group and individual counselor and licensed social worker, this investigator has provided both direct and administrative services in a variety of roles. Working with families of special needs students consistently during this period, the author became familiar with the characteristics and symptoms of children with handicaps and the effect on family dynamics and interactions. Similarly, as a special education coordinator in a small inner-city school system, this researcher has observed, recorded and analyzed the dynamics and interactions between special and regular education administrators and teachers. In

this capacity, the investigator has successfully mediated resolution between polarized parties both formally through mediation and hearing processes and informally, directly with parents, teachers, adminstrators and legal counsel.

Augmenting experiential knowledge, this investigator has continued study in education and instructional leadership adding to an academic background in human services. Undergraduate training in liberal arts and classical music, a masters degree in counseling and expressive therapy and additional training required for certification as a group and family therapist and licensed certified social worker, have combined to provide the author with a substantial foundation upon which to interpret the data compiled from the questionnaire and to interpret the psychodynamics of the relationship between regular and special education administrators.

This investigator's academic and professional experience has included extensive theory and practice in the art of interviewing acquired during twenty four years as a practicing psychotherapist/counselor/social worker/educator and administrator. Formal training was also provided to this researcher by the State Department of Mental Health, first as a grant

administrator for a mental health facility conducting needs assessments in preparation for a variety of grant proposals; and later as a graduate student selected as a Mental Health "Fellow" in psychotherapy.

The decision to utilize a combination of the questionnaire and interview to investigate the educational gatekeeper's ability and experience in implementing special education mandates was selected as the best method for this investigator to maximize her own resources in recording the first-hand experience of school managers.

Participants

Four special education administrators, nine regular education administrators, four special education and four regular education teachers were contacted in total. These participants were selected from suggested personnel recommended by the superintendent, other administrators or instructional staff from within a particular system. They were generally selected because of their known interest and support or opposition to the subject of study.

TABLE 2 lists the actual years of professional experience for all research participants in their current position. All four community special education

administrators had been in their present position for an average of 4.1 years, regular education administrators for an average of 7.5 years. Special education teachers interviewed had been in their current and/or similar positions for an average of 7.5 years and regular education teachers interviewed had been in their current and/or similar positions for an average of 24.25 years.

TABLE 2

Participants Years In Current Position

Special Education Administrators

Community A	2 years	5 years prev exp
Community B	1.4 years	2 years prev exp
Community C	9 years	0 years prev exp
Community D	4 years	0 years prev exp

Regular Education Administrators

Community A	11 years	-Jr. High Principal
Community A	17 years	-Elementary Principal
Community B	5 months	-Elementary Principal
Community B	1 year	-Jr. High Principal
Community C	2 years	-Middle School Principal
Community C	3 years	-Elementary Principal
Community D	12 years	-Elementary Principal
Community D	17 years	-Elementary Principal
Community D	4 years	-Pupil Personnel Director

Special Education Teachers

Community A	9 years	Jr-High Resource
Community B	7 years	Elementary Resource
Community C	7 years	Middle School 502.4
Community D	7 years	Elementary 502.4 I

(continued next page)

TABLE 2 (cont.)

Regular Education Teachers

Community A	17 years	Elementary
Community B	22 years	Elementary
Community C	28 years	Elementary
Community D	30 years	Elementary

Advantages and Limitations to Methodology.

Development of a sound questionnaire requires both skill and time. However, the use of a questionnaire has definite advantages over other methods of collecting data that are not available from other sources. It is more efficient, less expensive, can be standardized easily, is convenient to the respondent, provides access to responses not normally available, (e.g. thoughts, feelings.) and because they are usually self administered, protects anonymity (Sudman 1982, Berdie, 1974, Gay 1987).

The interview is essentially the oral, in person, administration of a questionnaire to each member of a selected sample or study. It's advantages, when well conducted, can produce in-depth data not possible with a questionnaire; it is most appropriate for asking questions which cannot be structured into a multiple-choice format. In contrast to the questionnaire, the interview is flexible; it allows a rapport between the subject and interviewer, it can

clarify and ensure understanding; it makes possible the acquisition of additional information other than the original questions, it ensures a greater response rate -interviews-95%; questionnaires-45% (Gordon 1975, Gay 1987, Patton 1980).

The combination of employing a multiple choice questionnaire and semi-structured interview yielded objective and in-depth results which are both tabulated and explained. Unstructured or open-ended questions facilitated explanation and understanding of the responses to structured questions (Gay 1987).

Checking for reliability and validity is limited for questionnaire responses, the length and breadth of the questions are limited, the possibility of a low response rate is high and the indvidual's hostility toward the questionnaire may affect the validity of response (Sudman 1982, Berdie 1974, Gay 1987, & Babbie 1973). Nine of twelve questionnaires were returned. Three non-returnee's were contacted by mail and phone. Two responded that they had completed the survey and mailed it and one declined to respond. Follow-up questionnaires were sent to the three parties where surveys had not been recieved along with self -addressed stamped envelopes. No response was received. One party from community A indicated an

emphatic no-interest response. The other respondents were included in the interview process.

The interview is expensive and time consuming and generally involves smaller samples. Direct interviewer-interviewee contact is open to many biases and the interviewer needs to be trained and skilled in the art of interviewing. A good command of a variety of communication and interactive skills is essential (Gay 1987, Gordon 1975, Patton 1980). This researcher found all subjects willing to be interviewed and each provided in-depth and extensive response to questions posed. Although this study is a small sample of the total school population, the willingness of the participants was uniformly characteristic and a strong indicator that there is a great need for providing a forum in which educators can share thoughts, feelings, ideas and strategies for school improvement which involve teachers and administrators on an equal basis.

Despite the limitations of selected methods of research, the advantages far outweigh the restrictions, and thus provide data important to the understanding of the role of the middle level administrator in public education.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The first part of the data for this study emerged from the school administrator survey distributed to a total of twelve school administrators. Nine surveys or 75%, were returned.

The first part of the survey provided statistical information relevant to numbers of students receiving special education services, instructional staffing and kinds of specialists utilized to provide mandated services for each system. The second part of the survey provided information relevant to form and frequency of communication between regular and special education staff and administration; responsibility and follow-through with due process as it impacted program development, and early childhood intervention. The last three questions dealt with administrative model and style.

The second part of this study provided information from interviews with four special education administrators, nine regular education administrators, four special education teachers and four regular education teachers.

Results of the Survey

An analysis and comparison of students by prototype for each community reveals that the majority of students in each of the four systems receive special education services in 502.2 programs for no more than 25% of their school day. Some of these students receive this assistance in the mainstream classes in generic models. The actual breakdown was not defined. However in Communities A and D the majority of 502 .2 students are in a generic model classroom. In communities B and C most of the 502.2 services are rendered in pull-out programs or in resource or learning centers separate from the regular class. This data was clarified during the interviews with all special education administrators.

Self contained classes, or 502.4 prototype, is the second largest category of special needs students in communities A and C, both inner cities. The majority of these classes are for emotionally disturbed and behavior problem children. This is the most challenging and most rapidly growing population as reported by both special education administrators from these communities. The actual data for prototype placements can be reviewed in the subsequent TABLE 3.

TABLE 3

Analysis of Prototype Placements

Prototype	Community A	B	C	D
502.1	104	33	93	52
502.2	637	205	348	189
502.3	340	21	58	51
502.4	400	30	151	27
502.4i	75	0	14	0
502.5	90	7	27	8
502.6	60	0	9	4
502.7	20	3	5	2
502.8b	40	0	45	0
502.8c	0	8	11	17
502.9	20	1	0	0
502.10	0	0	3	0
502.11	3	0	0	0
Survey Totals	1735	308	744	324
October 1,1989 Census Totals	1690	313	736	359

Survey data was obtained between October 15, 1989 and December 1, 1989 which may account for the discrepancy between the totals derived from the October First Census Totals as published by the State Department of Education. The discrepancy is not substantial and overall has no bearing on the interpretation of survey data, except to demonstrate the ever present fluctuation in special education student census.

The percentage of students in more restrictive prototypes are higher in the two cities surveyed. This

conforms with the findings of recent research presented by J. D. Singer et al. in her study reported in 1986. [73] and the Massachusetts Advocacy Center Project on Mainstreaming as directed by J. K. Landau (1987). [74]

Response Rate to Survey Questions

Questions 6 through 15 provided information relative to staffing. The responses to these questions varied according to the role of the respondent. Principals gave data for their respective building and Special Education Administrators provided system wide data for special education personnel only in Community A and C. Pupil Personnel Directors for Community B and D provided system wide data for these questions.

Community A special education administrator responded to question 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15, all related to special education staffing or consultants. No response was given for questions 7, 8, and 9 which relate to regular education in community A. All other questions were answered.

Community A principal responded to all questions with the exception of no. 5 -identify students in special education by prototype. The question was left blank on the survey.

Community C special education administrator responded "unknown" to questions 6, 8 and 9 which relate to regular education. All other queries were given response.

Community C middle school principal responded to all questions from 1 through 15 . No response was provided for questions 19 and 23, both related to follow-up for pre-referral or child study team meetings. Questions 30 through 39 were left blank. These related to Appeals, mediation and resulting program development, early childhood intervention and administrative model and style.

Community B special education administrator responded to all questions on the survey and provided a hand-drawn organizational chart for this system. As noted in Chapter III, this administrator was appointed as Pupil Personnel Director for this system in July 1988. All responses to the survey were carefully researched as were the responses to the interview questions.

Community B elementary principal had been in this position for five months with 10 years prior experience as a principal for an elementary school in a northern

bordering state. Questions 30, 31 (appeals) and 39 (administrative style) were not answered on the survey.

Community D survey was sent to the Director of Pupil Personnel and all questions were given careful and thorough response including a hand drawn organizational chart. Interestingly, this staff person listed her position under regular education and responded to question 2 with the comment "neither". The Special Education Director participated in the interview process when she returned from a leave of absence. Hence a shared response is recorded from this community.

Two elementary principal's from community D provided responses. Each has been very involved with mainstreaming special needs students but with stylistic differences in management and motivation. Both principals responded to all questions with the exception of numbers 30 and 31 related to the impact of due process on program development.

Communication and interaction between special and regular education were the focus of questions 16 to 23. Community A utilizes a pre-referral process twice a month which is co-facilitated by a building principal or designee and a special educator. They also use a

child study team or its comparative to review referrals for special education twice a month according to the responses checked by both administrators. The special education administrator checked all listed positions for question 22, as those who are responsible for these meetings within building or system. The regular education principal checked only his position in response to this question. Both administrators noted follow-up meetings to pre-referral and child study team meetings.

Community B also uses pre-referral and child study team processes. Responsibility for these meetings appear to be shared at the elementary level and the responsibility of only special education at the junior high level. System-wide there are two meetings per week and at one elementary school these meetings are held on an as needed basis. There is no formal follow-up meeting to assess the outcome of these processes on a system-wide basis. However, at the one elementary school surveyed, a follow-up system has been implemented since the arrival of the new principal.

Community C uses the child study team as a pre-referral and referral process. This team meets in each school, elementary through high school, every other week. The team is chaired by the principal or

designee which could be either a special or regular educator assigned to that building. These meetings are also the forum for follow-up progress reports.

Community D uses Student Assistance Teams (SAT) for weekly review and pre-referral processes. Every other week these meetings review students who may need to be referred for evaluation through the Chapter 766 process. These students are referred only after documented efforts and results have been presented to the Student Assistance Teams. The building principal and guidance counselor chair these meetings at elementary grades kindergarten through eight. At the high school level, the building principal and the special education staff chair these meetings.

Questions 24 through 31 focus on the appeals and mediation process. The urban systems A and C have been involved with the highest number of mediation and appeals process cases. All four systems have developed programs as a result of decisions rendered through either appeals or mediation effecting a wide range of student needs. The majority of cases in community A represented students with emotional or behavioral disorders; in community B, moderate learning disabilities; in community C, moderate learning disabilities; and community D was evenly split between

moderate learning disabilities and mild developmental delays.

Community A is currently in it's third year of a court and citizen consent decree as a result of a class action suit brought against the school department on behalf of special needs students by a strong parent advocacy group. As a result of this decree the special education department is under daily scrutiny by representatives of the court and parent advocacy group. All processes and decisions have to be approved by this group before being implemented.

Questions 32 through 36 address early childhood and kindergarten screening. All four communities administer this mandated screening in an effort to provide early identification and intervention for children with disabilities.

Community A provides spring and fall kindergarten screening conducted by both regular and special educators. Early childhood screening is on-going all year and administered by special educators.

Community B provides kindergarten screening in the spring, while early childhood screening for two and one half and three year olds is conducted throughout the year. Both are coordinated by the special education

administrator and results are reviewed at each elementary building with both special and regular educators.

Fall is community C's chosen time to conduct kindergarten screening. Early childhood screening is administered in the spring during kindergarten registration. Kindergarten screening is coordinated by a special educator and early childhood screening is conducted by school nurses with special education consultation as needed. There is currently a proposal to shift this coordination to the Early Childhood Director for next year.

Community D provides kindergarten screening in the spring and early childhood screening is on-going. Both are the responsibility of the special education administrator who coordinates the process with elementary principals, kindergarten teachers and specialists. Results are reviewed at both the building and system levels.

Questions 37 through 39 focused on organizational model and administrative style. Community A special education director checked special education services and described his style as "collaborative". His narrative description is as follows: "Utilize the

competencies and abilities of staff to the maximum benefit of the program through a strong communication and awareness program. Be sure that staff understands the whole picture so their particular responsibilities are successfully interwoven and recognized." No organizational chart was submitted with this survey. Community A principal selected special education services and noted his administrative style as "non-descript".

Community B pupil personnel director described her administrative style as collaborative, commenting:

> I prefer a democratic decision-making process involving all parties affected by my decisions. I would like to believe that I'm open, flexible and accessible to all. I work with an open-door policy to other administrators, teachers, students and parents. I also consider myself as a teacher to those I work with; sharing information that will assist us in making informed decisions.

Community B principal checked pupil personnel services and described her administrative style as collaborative. No narrative was provided on the survey instrument.

Community C special education assistant director noted special education services as that system's model and described his style of administration as collaborative:

> My goal is to motivate professional staff and to create an educational environment in which

> people feel supported and creative, one where people can experiment and feel that each has a significant contribution to make to the children and school system. Accomplishments are to be recognized and shared. Many times this goal falls short of being achieved.

Community C principal noted special education services as the model but did not respond to questions 38 and 39 regarding administrative style.

Community D pupil personnel director noted both special education services and pupil personnel as administrative models within this system. Special Education falls under the aegis of pupil personnel. The pupil personnel director described her style as collaborative noting: "an attempt to balance the human relations with attention to tasks and task completion. Communication with building principals and program administrators is critical to PPS service delivery systems."

Community D Principal (a) noted pupil personnel as the model for system delivery; he circled collaborative and stated : "I'm very involved and I hire the best teachers and then allow them to flourish. I believe there is room in my school to permit teachers assertiveness as well as team play." Principal (b) submitted an organizational chart and did not note his style of administration on the survey.

All three administrators from community D provided a chart of organizational distribution. Each was hand drawn and represented the entire school system.

Survey Summary

Responses from community A, B, and C administrators were related to their particular responsibility. Special educators provided information about special education and regular education (principals) gave responses related to non-special education. Community D administrators provided a more comprehensive set of responses that accounted for both general and special education. This may be construed as reflective of the differences in administrative style or leadership indicated by the community D respondents.

TABLE 4

Administrative Model and Style of Leadership

Community	Position Reg/Sped		Model	Style
A		x	SES	Collaborative
A	x		SES	Non-descript
B		x	PPS	Collaborative
B	x		PPS	Collaborative
C		x	SES	Collaborative
C	x		SES	No response
D	x		PPS&SES	Collaborative
D(a)	x		PPS	Collaborative
D(b)	x		PPS	No response

Preliminary findings based on the survey responses would indicate that Community A, B, and C tend to operate as dual systems of education, the primary system is for the general or regular student population and the secondary system for students with special needs. The interviews however provide a more comprehensive view for further consideration.

In general the model of administration appears to have a lesser impact than the style of administration relative to implementing the mandates of special education. Community B and D each use the Pupil Personnel Service (PPS) model, and Community A and C have selected the Special Education Services (SES) model, however, there are clear differences as to how

each of these systems has implemented special education services. All four systems have accepted special education as part of the educational services to be provided for students. All four systems have implemented the mandates as prescribed by Chapter 766 and Public Law 94-142. However, each of the four systems has a spectrum of perspectives on how special education relates to the whole system of education.

Analysis of Interviews

All twenty interviews took place between December 1, 1989 and March 15, 1990.

Twelve questions were asked of each person interviewed (Appendix F). These queries were designed to elicit information related to the five research questions noted in Chapter I. The responses have been organized into four general categories:

Implementation/intervention

Interactions/communication

Mainstreaming/integration enhancers and obstacles

Recommendations

Personnel interviewed from each community are identified in TABLE 5.

TABLE 5

Personnel Interviewed for Gatekeepers Study

Community A:	Special Education Director
	Elementary Principal
	Elementary Regular Education Teacher
	Middle School Principal
	Middle School Special Education Teacher
Community B:	Pupil Personnel Director
	Elementary Principal
	Elemenatry Regular Education teacher
	Elementary Special Education Teacher
	Assistant Principal Junior High School
Community C:	Assistant Special Education Director
	Elementary Principal
	Elementary Regular Education teacher
	Middle School Principal
	Middle School Special Education Teacher
Community D:	Special Education Director
	Elementary Principal
	Elementary Principal
	Elementary Regular Education Teacher
	Elementary Special Education Teacher

Community A

Community A special education director has an assistant who acts as a supervisor for collegial core evaluation chairpersons, head teachers and guidance staff.

> They (Core Evaluation Chairpersons) are the harbingers of policy; they facilitate the implementation. There's not a lot of middle management in this city. In fact, they (school system) have the same number of administrators for special education now as when we only had 200 students. For instance, our chair people do not have an authoritative or supervisory role, yet they are asked to assume the mantel of omniscience in this system. I have recommended that be changed, however, there is a layer of resistance from higher levels of administration and the school committee.

As noted earlier in this chapter, Community A is monitored weekly by the consent decree issued by the court and agreed to by the Parent Advisory Council, Department of Education and the City. Essentially, all parties agree to work toward changing some of the pre-existing policies to more adequately implement the law. The special education director was hired by the monitor committee and reports to this body once each week to review progress, request approval for purchase of equipment and services, and to have approved all forms used by the system to implement the special education regulations. According to this administrator, the decree provides affirmation of

whatever he requests within their powers. However, he further states;

> You can't do that and be responsible to a system at large. So what we try to do is administer as a team, otherwise you'd drive away regular education. We abide by the decree, but work as a team with regular education. I haven't used the consent decree a whole lot; I don't think that would be helpful to the system as a whole for the long term. I think it's better to develop a working relationship that will last long after the consent decree. Most administrators don't have that kind of backing or pressure. It's a killing job anyway; you can't win. Your always in the middle of two opposing forces. Special education has been pitted against regular education via the legislature's chosen way of doing things and through the court's decisions. I think that's wrong. Our job is to empower all education. A kid goes to school, he goes to school! Whatever he presents, you work with it. So he pitches the ball a little differently than his neighbor, he's still your student and a member of that school community. Just because he has a handicap shouldn't keep him from being part of the local school community. If you have a brother with a handicap, he doesn't stop being your brother or a member of your family. That's the original intent of Chapter 766. Initially the funding formula set special education apart -separate funding with a reimbursement formula that created havoc with local budgets. This created a huge schism which still exists, even though the funding has been changed to be inclusive of school based funding formula.

The elementary principal from community A (who has since become the new Superintendent) records his view of implementation:

> We try to take each child as he/she is. This is an inner city school with a large minority population; Black, Hispanic and Asian, and it's a poor neighborhood. There are families with many problems. So we try to accommodate to this diverse population. All kids should have an individualized education plan. In this building

we have an interdisciplinary team which includes bilingual, special education and regular education staff who meet every week. Now understand, we have a court consent decree monitor for special education, a bilingual state department representative and a federal bilingual monitor all watching how we're doing what's required by law for each category of student. So sometimes we have conflict at these gatherings and the agenda may have more to do with bureaucracy than the kids. But generally we try to discuss what programs are working and what needs to be created etc.

...Before a kid get's referred in this building, we try every conceivable strategy to make him part of his class. If a kid has a fourth grade placement, but is reading at the second grade level, because he hasn't been in school much over the last few years for a variety of family/personal reasons, we get the materials needed, at his level, and the teacher works it out to have him learn in that class beginning with his existing level of ability. I'm fortunate. I have mostly experienced veteran teachers who know how to handle most any situation. It's a bit more difficult with a younger and less experienced teacher... That's when the principal becomes mentor and teacher support.

The elementary school teacher from this same building reported to feel very aligned with the philosophy of her principal. She has been teaching for 25 years (17 years in elementary education) and feels strongly that the special education regulations as defined by subsequent court decisions impede the process of equal education for all.

> Initially, I welcomed the input from the specialists, but over the first ten years I came to realize they were not open to my thoughts and professional suggestions. At first, most of the specialists felt a need to remove the children from regular education environments, that's the way the law was written, individualized education

seemed to equate with out-of-the-regular-classroom-instruction-time. There was also an attitude of superiority, or a "we'll handle the problem, don't you bother" exuded from specialists when dealing with regular education teachers. I see that has changed somewhat, and at least in this building we try to work together and talk to each other about our students. Much of that change has to do with our Principal. He is very staunchly supportive of educating all our students with or without handicaps in the most normalized setting. Unfortunately some people in this city see that as depriving students of their rights. The consent decree seems to create another layer of bureaucratic tape. Children need to be with their peers to learn. It's not right to isolate those who learn more slowly or are physically disabled. However, within the past several years, I've noticed a shift toward bringing the kids back to where they belong, in their neighborhood schools, in classes with every other kid on the block. I feel responsible for every student in my class, and I've been able to teach the most deprived to the brightest. But now you have to adhere to so many regulations! I will refer a student only after every thing has been tried. This building has a weekly meeting with a representative from each of the specialties and the regular education staff to review how things are progressing and to share any teaching or student concerns. At times we're diverted from student needs with bureaucratic issues, but for the most part we focus on the student. The biggest problem is lack of time. Not enough hours in a day or week to talk with all the specialists, other teachers; we need more of that.

Representing another level of education in Community A, the principal and a special education teacher of a Junior High (recently transitioned to a middle school) shared a different perspective. The principal has been working hard to implement the middle school concept this year. There are five clusters of teachers and students each with a different rotating

schedule. Teachers are now part of a team and meet on a weekly basis. However special education teachers and students are not considered part of any cluster. According to the principal there are scheduling complications which continue to baffle administration but they hope to have them worked out by next year. This building of 500 students has a principal, an assistant principal, two head-teachers and a compliment of 50 teachers including two special education staff. There is a core chairperson assigned to the building. According to the special education teacher interviewed, normal procedure was for a teacher to refer a student for evaluation directly to the Core chairperson.

> Recently, however, a memo from central administration was distributed to staff defining a Child Study Team and encouraging staff to implement this procedure. As I understand, this meeting will be for pre-referral and referral purposes. As of the present, there is no child study team or pre-referral process in this building. Special education teachers are assigned for testing by the Core Evaluation Chairperson. But there is no time built into the daily schedule to evaluate or observe students. We test in the classroom during teaching periods and sometimes we attend the team meeting if schedule permits."

The principal noted that his staff was in a transition period adjusting to the newer middle school concept and "doing very well, overall". He foresaw that the cluster meetings would be the weekly forum for discussion of special needs issues if that was accepted

by all the teaching staff. Procedure up until this time has been direct referral from teacher to Core chairperson.

"Here when a student is referred it's a special education situation all the way. I mean if the kid's a problem in regular classes we need to get him out ...give him a smaller setting, more intensive attention or whatever it takes." This principal noted the diversity in school population which requires frequent adapting of curriculum and the constant demands set by government "bureaucrats" to ensure "compliance" with regulations for bilingual, special and remedial education.

The special education teacher interviewed at this building confirmed that there is a major gap between regular and special education within this new middle school. However, she was hopeful that the new cluster system, when it includes the specialists, will lessen this difference.

There is an obvious difference in how the administrators and teachers from the same system perceive their role in implementing special education.

Community B

Community B Pupil Personnel Services Director is responsible for Special Education, English as a Second Language, Guidance, Counseling, Psychology, Health Services and Testing. She confirms that Special Education is the greatest portion of her job as PPS director. Special Education teachers report directly to the PPS Director. This Director is on the same administrative level as a Principal and reports directly to the Superintendent. Procedures and standards for the various departments are set by the Pupil Personnel Services Director and all decisions affecting special education are made or approved at this level.

System efforts to support mainstreaming have been almost non-existent, according to the PPS Director. A Commonwealth In-Service grant has been written by the special education Parent Advisory Council (PAC) to bolster mainstreaming efforts by re-educating parents and teachers vis-a-vis learning disabilities, mainstreaming strategies and techniques, and learning styles. Although there is talk among administrators that mainstreaming is appropriate, no formal programs have been implemented. Most of the children in this

system, however, are mainstreamed. There are significantly higher numbers of 502.1 and 502.2 prototypes than more restrictive settings. One elementary school is currently making attempts to begin mainstreaming efforts with developmentally disabled children. In the past, children in substantially separate programs have not been mainstreamed at all. This is slowly changing through informal discussions, recommendations at Team Meetings, staff meetings, etc. Most efforts at mainstreaming have been individual and/or isolated efforts. There is no system-wide policy or standard to follow which was reported by all staff interviewed in Community B.

Overall, collaboration among regular and special educators occurs on a limited basis due to lack of time. At the elementary level communication and planning is more frequent and extremely positive. Teachers make concerted efforts to keep communication open. Although, this effort occurs during teachers lunch or prep time or after school. There is no time built into the daily schedule for regular or special education teaching staff to collaborate and plan. Despite this lack, the interest and commitment supports what one teacher calls "the bottom line... what is best for the student". As one proceeds through Junior

High and Senior High, the interaction decreases as reported by the Pupil Personnel Director.

> For the first time this year, our elementary special educators are seeing children within the regular classes. At the junior high level, grade level meetings are held twice weekly to discuss students' issues and needs. Special Educators participate in these meetings. At the high school level there is little collaboration and, at times, open resistance to special education. Very few teachers attend Team meetings, yet they will argue that the recommendations made at meetings are inappropriate. Regular educators at the high school fail to complete forms for evaluations or turn the data in to the special education office.

The Pupil Personnel Director also reports that lack of knowledge or understanding of the special education regulations hinders implementation and mainstreaming efforts. One of her goals for the next year is to provide a re-training for all staff, regular and special educators. Elementary staff interviewed were very supportive to continued training. Junior High and High School staff were reported as less enthusiastic about special education training.

All Community B staff interviewed reported a sense of fiscal tension which is reported to override communication and support at the school committee and community level. Although the Superintendent is reported as very supportive of Special Education, his pleas to the school committee are often met with

resistance, denial or assent only when forced with legal action from parent or the state.

The recently appointed Community B elementary principal reflected a state of shock at how quickly her requests for building adaptations for handicapped students were rejected for lack of funds.

> The school committee would rather send the student to an out-of-district placement than consider adapting the building, whether it be installation of a handrail in a bathroom or ramping an entrance. That attitude doesn't always make good fiscal or educational sense and it seems a violation of the intent of the law to provide equal education for all in the most normalized setting.

Within this building the regular and special educators interviewed reported great support for integration of students from this principal. It was a mutually reported sense of respect and appreciation for administrative and staff efforts. There was also an enthusiasm for restructuring programs to provide improved services for students with a pilot program underway at the kindergarten level. The regular educator noted that she enjoys collaborating with specialists to share information and exchange ideas and concerns. She reported that she was most unhappy with her role in the formal team meeting where she felt that an hour meeting often didn't provide enough time for full consideration of a student's total program

including the collaboration with specialists. "I'm the person ultimately responsible for their (students) education. I try to accommodate team recommendations even if the student is taken out of my classroom. I would prefer that the education occur in my classroom, but I work with all service providers." The special educator also enjoyed the collaboration but felt very pressured for time and in order to provide consultation to staff, she finds herself writing reports and IEP's after work hours and most weekends.

The Junior High staff reported many more obstacles which impede providing special education services within the mainstream. Primary lack was a consistent forum for communication between regular and special educators. Individual teachers connect with their peers informally to discuss a students needs, or to brainstorm suggestions for improving a students program. The Assistant Principal has more involvement with special needs students as she handles discipline. She reports her continuing goal is to get her teachers more formal time to collaborate so that many of the students now referred for special education could be considered and problems resolved within the mainstream classes at an earlier stage.

Community C

This inner city system, has a central Director of Special Education who reports to the Superintendent. There are five psychologist/coordinators assigned to the six elementary schools, one early childhood center, two middle schools and one comprehensive high school within this system and one social worker/coordinator responsible for all out of district and unique or sensitive student cases. Similar to Community A in that these professionals represent the Director or Central Office, and are often seen as "saviors" by building principals and teachers, but in fact have no administrative power. They coordinate, assess, conduct Team Meetings, and report Team recommendations to the Central Director for approval or not. They are liaisons for the Director to the assigned buildings or district.

The Coordinator acts as a consultant to Child Study Teams which are conducted in each building every other week. The CST is chaired by the building principal or designee providing a forum for regular and special educators to discuss student progress or problems, to suggest modifications, and to report results of modifications. According to the Director

interviewed, this process has historically been the first step toward a Chapter 766 referral.

> Although the coordinator and special educator are often participants they are more often than not looked to as the resource/specialist who will provide a solution to the problem. The anticipated solution has been to remove the student in whole or in part from the mainstream via the special education process. Hopefully, this will begin to change as one of our largest elementary schools has been selected by the Department of Education to participate in Mainstream Training.

System collaboration between regular and special educators has been limited in the past. As reported by the Director and both Principals interviewed. Communication has improved between special education and regular education administrators but, generally, is much more effective between and among staff at the building level. All Community C administrators commented on the separate and not equal status between regular and special education in general which has grown since the law went into effect. The elementary principal reported a heightened awareness of the need for collaboration among his regular educators and emphasized the need for a strong Special Education Coordinator essential to this goal. He further stated that the principal's role is to support all his staff, though at times it has been difficult to support his special education resource teacher. He cited attending

a conference two years ago which emphasized the importance of the role of principal in effecting special education.

> Too many principals act as islands set apart from special education. This conference recommended that principals be in control of all special education processes within their building. I wouldn't go that far. Being aware and supportive of the process is part of being a principal.

The Community C elementary Principal felt that the pull-out service delivery was the worst inhibitor to mainstreaming. "I'm sure it's an unintentional consequence, however, the rub is the pull-out. The regular education teacher feels this creates huge gaps and also feels left out of the learning process for this student." This Principal also cited lack of time for consultation between teachers as an obstacle to improved mainstreaming. "Effective integration comes down to the dynamics between teachers. We have a good rapport established among staff. We have some talented and creative teachers and they need to be able to spend time together to see each other work with children."

A pilot project was initiated this year allowing the special education teacher to work in the regular fourth grade class for language arts and reading instruction for half the day. The remaining half day he teaches in a resource setting for small groups and

individual instruction. This principal feels strongly that.." there is more value to instruction/teaching/learning with kids in a normalized setting than the artificial environment of a resource or pull-out program."

The regular education teacher interviewed was the fourth grade teacher participating in this team approach. "The principal suggested the idea. He didn't give us any pressure ...just said to try it. We each feel somewhat uncomfortable getting used to this, but in time it will work out." This teacher also was in concert with her principal regarding the pull-out programs. "It inhibits learning and teaching, splits up the day, confuses the student and does nothing for self-esteem which is so important to learning." She further states;

> Ideally, with such a diverse and needy population, if you could provide reinforcement of skills during the summer, there would be less need for pull-out reinforcement during the school year, which I frankly feel is not at all effective. This new experiment has potential. It is really just an extension of my own teaching philosophy. I like to arrange students in small heterogeneous groups of four or five including one student with special needs in each group. These students are usually very talented and need to feel a sense of achievement. The cooperative learning model is a good vehicle for learning and reinforcement.

Consistent with all other instructional participants interviewed for this study, conjoint

planning time and consultation with other teachers is very difficult to find.

The Middle School Principal interviewed from Community C acknowledged that it has been a slow and very gradual shift toward mainstreaming students with special needs in this building. She credits the self-contained teachers for taking the initiative and persistently making in-roads with individual regular education staff. "Presently all our self-contained kids are mainstreamed for at least one 80 minute block of specialist time (music, art, industrial arts) with the exception of the first quarter. Initially, students remain with their class for the first quarter until they are familiar with the school routine and expectations."

Collaboration between special education self-contained teachers and the regular clusters is "... person to person, teacher to teacher. They do not have the time or schedule freedom to participate in the weekly cluster meetings, so they meet as they can." Middle School Principal from Community C reports that the middle school concept has taken five years to truly begin to implement and only within the last two years has there been any significant change in curriculum and teaching methodology. Retraining and in-service

courses are offered to staff on a volunteer basis and this has absorbed a great deal of the principal's energy in supporting and reinforcing the general education staff. This middle school also has the largest proportion of self-contained classes, with two behavior classes, two language learning disabilities classes, one basic skills and one functional skills class. Although these teachers are not part of a cluster, the principal reports that they have received great support from both building administrators in handling some difficult students. Mainstreaming the special education staff has not been a priority and this middle school principal notes that it is a need which should eventually be addressed.

One program that has enhanced mainstreaming less restrictive Community C middle school students with special needs is the expansion of the generic specialist role within the mainstream classes. A special educator volunteers at each grade level to co-teach with a general educator in the reading and math classes. It's a situation which continues to improve with experience, additional training and support for all staff involved. Its success will depend on how well the teachers can work together in sharing instructional and preparation time. "That is a

dynamic that depends solely on the personality and temperament of participating teachers."

Another area that has improved the mainstreaming of students, particularly from the self-contained classes, is the implementation of standardized curriculum for all three grade levels. This is the first year that the self-contained classes are utilizing the same curriculum for grade level language arts, social studies and science. Theme materials and presentation are adapted to the needs and ability level of the students. The same information/theme is presented to the students in self-contained classes with a different approach.

All regular education classes are heterogeneously grouped and this is the second year of Cooperative Learning training. Not all teachers are fully committed to this concept. However, the Principal views this model as another avenue for improving instruction and reducing the use of resource or pull-out programming.

Grading systems were also changed to reflect an individual's progress. Using the terms; outstanding, good, good progress or not and failing was intended to allow the student to compete against him/herself and

for teachers to grade on the potential and actual performance of each individual student. A combination of parent and some teacher resistance to this system caused the school committee to request a return to the numerical and letter system of grading. The Community C middle school principal viewed this as a loss for the students and faculty but also noted that innovation and letting go of old traditions requires time, public relations and persistence. She states she has "... time and persistence but public relations will require an additional body and different personality."

A special education teacher from the Community C Middle School provided another perspective. She has been assigned to a self-contained class for students with language learning disabilities. Her class is physically located in the basement next to a similar class and down the hall from two other self-contained classes for students with functional and basic skills potential. She works closely with a speech and language pathologist who co-teaches a language lesson twice a week and consults on a regular basis.

Collaboration with the regular education staff occurs when this teacher wants to mainstream one of her students for an academic subject. She arranges to talk with the regular education teacher to first determine

if the teacher will be acceptable to working with a special needs student in a regular class. These conversations may occur over a period of several weeks to several months depending on the experience of the teacher with mainstreaming a special needs student. If the teacher is amenable the student is gradually introduced to the mainstream class, sometimes with the accompaniment of an aide or the special education teacher.

> When one of my students is mainstreamed, I consult with that teacher or teachers to check on progress almost daily and definitely weekly. I do not attend cluster meetings as my grade span is 6-7-8. Schedules do not allow for meeting with any of the grade cluster teams. I most often use my prep time or before and after school and lunch for meeting with individual teachers from the mainstream. I'm pretty isolated as a self-contained teacher. If I get upstairs once during the day, I 'm lucky! My primary focus is my kids; my interaction with other teachers has to do with my students being in their classes.

This teacher reported that she has always been supported by her principals in terms of materials, time and discipline issues. She also has been sought out as the expert within her building in the area of language learning disabilities providing consultation to teachers and conducting in-service workshops for specialists, music, art, technical and physical education staff. Although she initiates and follows through in all areas of communication regarding her

students with mainstream staff, she has not always been provided with reciprocal communication.

> Problems arise in mainstreaming when there is a lack of communication between regular and special education staff and the student will evidence this gap in reduced performance. This is a barrier that needs to be addressed in a more formal structured time for planning and collaboration between special and mainstream staff. I love working with the same curriculum for all grade levels; sixth grade social studies is the same throughout the city. This helps diminish the feeling of separate and unequal expressed by all students regarding special education. It also makes mainstreaming students an easier and more viable option.

The Community C special education teacher would recommend assigning her students to a cluster for home room. They presently participate in grade level mainstream classes for art, music, technical and physical education classes. "If they were assigned to a cluster, it would help them feel less stigmatized and more a part of the normal school routine. Their self-esteem is fragile. This would make them feel better, and increase their motivation for learning."

Similar to other community teachers, she would like more scheduled time for collaboration and planning.

Community D

This seaside suburban community has taken a very pro-active stance in the area of mainstreaming students with special needs according to the Director of Special Education. The model of management is through a Pupil Personnel Director who oversees the Director of Special Education, Guidance Director, Health Director, and all curriculum directors. The Director of Special Education supervises the program and instructional development in conjunction with building principals. This community houses five elementary schools, one middle school and one high school. Adjustment or guidance counselors act as building team meeting leaders.

Principals coordinate the Student Assistance Teams which meet in each building every other week. The SAT is the pre-referral forum for discussion of student needs, teacher and principal input and recommendations for adapting the mainstream classroom to a particular student's needs. The elementary school principals interviewed found this process helpful. The regular education teacher interviewed described the SAT as another layer of bureaucracy as it does not build in enough time for staff to use this forum as a resource; and the Special Education Director felt that it was a

mixed blessing, depending on the building principal and staff.

Community D Elementary Principal "A" instituted his own version of the Student Assistant Team twenty years ago and reported that:

> Mainstreaming special needs students policies have been around this system for a very long time. Our policy has always been the least restrictive setting first, the students classroom with adaptations; the next step would be to add a specialist to the class. If these steps do not produce a positive learning experience for the youngster, than we would request assessments from one or more of the specialists. This is all without referring to special education.

The SAT hears progress reports and provides continued input and support for the teachers and specialists. The building team consists of a classroom teacher, guidance counselor, gym teacher, special education/resource teacher, a speech and language therapist and occupational therapist. Once a month, the guidance counselor, principal, school psychologist, resource teacher meet to review issues and problems not resolved at the SAT level.

If the SAT recommends a referral for Special Education Evaluation, then the principal, guidance counselor and teacher meet with the parent to review the process and request permission for testing.

The special education teacher interviewed from Community D very rarely attends a Student Assistant Team meeting. She teaches a self contained Kindergarten class for children with a range of disabilities from language delays, Downs Syndrome, through pervasive developmental delays. She works with six students, two teacher assistants and speech, physical and occupational therapists in accord with each of her students Individual Education Plans. She reports that these students require a lot of structure and consistent expectations. Any change requires careful planning and preparation. Mainstreaming efforts have been consistently implemented with the cooperation of the regular education teacher. Both of these professionals are strong advocates for normalization. As reported by the special educator interviewed:

> I feel it's extremely important to expose kids to more normal peers. But, I also feel it requires planning and careful preparation to succeed, especially with more involved children. Frankly, I do a lot of that, after school hours with a wonderful and receptive regular kindergarten teacher. There is no time allocated for planning and consultation during the school day. I think that is a problem for all teachers throughout the system. We try to work out the planning time as best we can. Most often that means breakfast meetings or after school and evening sessions.

This teacher also noted a sense of isolation from the rest of the building with the exception of the

regular education kindergarten teacher who was located across the hall from her special needs classroom.

The regular education teacher interviewed noted the need of more sensitization for the whole school population regarding the more severely disabled students. As an example she addressed the scenario of her regular fourth grade students interacting with a student born with Downs Syndrome. This student had trouble with swallowing and eating his lunch in a tidy manner due to tongue placement difficulty. The fourth grade teacher quickly sought out the special educator, explained the problem and the regular students' reaction. The special educator took the Downs Syndrome child aside each day for the next two days and with a hand mirror, taught him to control his tongue, wipe his mouth and eat his lunch in a less messy fashion. He returned to the class and there have been no negative comments or reactions directed toward this student during lunch. "The current issue is.. how come he can make a mess in his tote tray and I can't?"

> These are the issues, the human issues that must first be resolved before we can deal with restructuring, length of school day, equal opportunity etc., because the real issues are harder. It is much harder to take the time to run down the hall, find the mirror, find the time to sit with a child and follow-up. Its those kind of issues which need to be addressed in mainstreaming.

Community D Principals and Special Education Director interviewed, all reported enormous support from the superintendent and school committee. The teachers interviewed reported similar support with great accolades for their principals but had little or no contact from administration above the principal. One teacher felt the principal was the pivotal person to set the tone for any school setting, while the special education teacher agreed, she also felt that some evidence of support or acknowledgement from the special education or pupil personnel director was warranted.

Unanimous comments from all Community D educators interviewed noted a lack of planning time between teachers and specialists as a primary deterrent to facilitate mainstreaming. Flexibility in scheduling was the most often noted enhancer to mainstreaming special needs students. And good regular education teachers were cited as the primary enhancer by both principals and the special education director for Community D. As one Community D Principal noted; "I hire very good teachers who are sympathetic to the special needs population, they are willing to adapt, they are sensitive and well trained. If you can staff

with that direction it's easier to work the special educators with the regular education staff."

The Special Education Director felt that the Chapter 766 regulations are open to such diverse legal and educational interpretation that this has created unrealistic expectations among parents and community social service agencies.

> This open ended interpretation has created friction and adversity at times between parents and schools, and now in times of greater fiscal difficulty the schism between regular and special education grows wider. Until there is clarity regarding the entrance and exit criteria for special education services all education will be negatively impacted. Schools are asked to provide more than education; (i.e) socialization, health, nutrition, crisis intervention, drug and alcohol rehabilitation. It's an impossible task to ask of a system established to teach knowledge and understanding within 6 hours per day 5 days a week for 38 weeks a year, and can only lead to failed expectations and disappointment.

Summary Analysis of Interviews.

The four North-of-Boston school systems represented are located within a geographical radius of ten miles of each border, all are ocean fronted and collectively represent a spectrum of the population from least to most affluent. Community A represents the largest population (77,890) and the least-wealthy, Community C is the second most populous (38,420) and least-wealthy system. Both Community A and C are categorized as small inner city/urban communities.

Community B (13,260) and Community D (19,390) are both affluent suburban towns.

Community A and C, both inner city urban centers, share similar administrative structures utilizing a Special Education Director with representation to school buildings through a Teacher/Team chairperson as in Community A and a Psychologist/Social Worker Coordinator in Community C. The Pupil Personnel Director is responsible for the implementation and follow through in Community B and the Pupil Personnel Director and Special Education Director divide responsibility in Community D, with building principals and guidance counselors acting as team chairpersons.

All subjects interviewed were unanimous in their notation of lack of time to collaborate, plan and review progress between instructional staff as a major obstacle to effective mainstreaming. Elementary principals and teachers interviewed in all communities felt the greatest enhancer to mainstreaming students with special needs were good regular or general education teachers and supportive principals. Middle School or Junior High special and general educators reported that mainstreaming was almost exclusively left to the special educators ability to develop a rapport

with a regular education staff on an individual case by case basis, particularly for self-contained classes.

Communication between regular and special educators was reported to be more frequent at the elementary level across all four systems. Community A used a once a week building interdisciplinary team, Community B had no formal system for regular interaction between teachers and relied on the teaching staff to find time before or after school hours. Community C utilized a Child Study Team which meets every other week in each building and Community D uses an interdisciplinary Student Assistant Team which also convenes on alternate weeks.

Special Education Directors from Community A and D felt the legal interpretations and open ended or non-labeling criteria established in Chapter 766 were the greatest deterrents to mainstreaming. In contrast, the Pupil Personnel Director from Community B and the Special Education Director from Community C, both felt that teachers and principals lack of interest and/or understanding the Special Education law, prevented mainstreaming special education students within their respective systems.

Communities A, B and C very clearly operate as two separate systems of education: general/regular education and special education.

Communities A and C are both larger, urban systems with a spectrum of ethnic diversity and socioeconomic needs. These factors may have contributed to the need to establish a separate structure to implement the special education law and insure compliance. Community A administrators reported to have worked to maintain students within the neighborhood schools particularly at the elementary level. This effort was reported to be often misunderstood by a few parents who successfully litigated for the "more and separate is better syndrome". Community C was initially cited by the Department of Education for gross non-compliance during the early years of implementation and hence developed a separate central office structure to ensure adherence to the regulations. This community has focused more on compliance issues as opposed to developing a collaboration between the two systems.

Community B the smallest system studied, has strongly resisted acknowledgement of the special education law and continues to deny students with more involved special needs, access to education within the local schools, preferring to place the student in an

out-of-district setting. This attitude is particularly pronounced at the school committee and community level. Significantly, Community B has seen the most rapid turnover of Pupil Personnel Directors than any of the other systems in this study. Of the three fairly new administrators interviewed, two, the elementary principal and the pupil personnel director, indicated a strong professional value and commitment to integrating students with disabilities in the mainstream. Both are in the process of assessing the systems culture, building coalitions of support within the system/elementary school to effect improvement.

Community D has long standing established policies to provide for all their students a quality education within their own system. Building principals have always been viewed as the responsible administrator to ensure education is provided for all students within their buildings. Additional incentive is provided to principals through merit pay raises to creatively utilize building staff to maintain a student with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. The majority of students in Community D with mild to moderate learning handicaps are remediated within the general class setting, utilizing the generic specialist in language arts and math classes. Additional

remediation is provided for students who require more reinforcement or additional tutorial in the resource centers at elementary level. Study skill centers at middle and high school levels are collaboratively staffed by special education teachers, Chapter I tutors and Remedial Reading teachers and a rotation of regular education teachers from each department, i.e. English, Math, Science and Social Studies. This resource is available to all students at middle school and high school.

Community D schools appear more integrated and philosophically are more aligned with the principles outlined in the Regular Education Initiative.

Endnotes Chapter IV

[73] Judith D. Singer, J. Butler, S. Palfrey, D. K. Walker, (1986) Characteristics of special education placements: Findings from probability samples in five metropolitan school districts, Journal of Special Education 20 (3) p. 319-337.

[74] Julia K. Landau, Massachusetts Advocacy Center, Out of the mainstream: Education of disabled youth in Massachusetts, (Boston: Author 1987)

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF STUDY

Synthesis of Findings

The findings from the survey and interviews of the special and regular educator administrators and teachers from the four North-of-Boston communities coincide with much of the research previously cited. The response to the research questions of this study provides a field-based description of how middle managers in public education in four neighboring communities have:

1. viewed the evolution of the special education law and implementation process.

2. included or excluded, owned or disowned special education during 15 years of state and federal mandates.

3. mainstreamed or integrated regular and special needs students.

4. dealt with fiscal restraints of Proposition 2 1/2 as they effect education and mainstreaming of students with disabilities.

5. become more or less concerned with "due process" and parent's rights than with quality education.

1. Evolution, implementation and incorporation of the special education mandates have been adopted by all four community school systems involved in this study. In accord with much of the research on school improvement, each of these communities has incorporated the change at varying rates (Goodlad, 1975, Huberman & Miles, 1982, Jones & Maloy, 1988, Miller & Lieberman, 1988, Sarason, 1982). Communities A and C, both multi-ethnic and socioeconomically diverse inner-cities, have been assisted with compliance through state and federal regulators overseeing procedural implementation. Community B, the smallest, affluent, suburban town, continues to resist the mandates for mainstreaming more involved students with disabilities, while neighboring, affluent suburb, Community D has successfully upheld a strong commitment to education for all students in the least restrictive environment.

2. The principal is clearly identified as the primary change agent effecting positive outcomes in school improvement projects (Wang & Zollers 1990, Will, 1986). The Rand Change Agent Study (Berman &

McLaughlin 1978) and J. W. Little's work (1981) on staff development in urban schools view the principal as the central actor in the drama of school renewal. Building principals are operationally and legally responsible for implementing the individual education plan for students with disabilities (O'Reilly & Sayler, 1985). In community A, B and C, however, ultimate program responsibility is viewed as belonging to the central office special education administrator, who becomes the gatekeeper of the regulations. A disparity may exist between the ideal and real. People enter the profession for generally positive reasons and find circumstances and conditions disrupt their plans; they become gatekeepers but are not prepared to concede that point. Therefore, building principals have not been empowered or inclined to support building ownership for students with disabilities (Will, 1986). Exceptions, in varying degrees, were reported in Community A, B and C. Community D administrators reported a more integrated system with a long standing commitment to mainstreaming students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.

3. Across all four communities, lack of time for planning, observation and communication between specialist and mainstream providers was a consistently noted deterrent to successful mainstreaming and program

planning for all students (Chalfant & Van Dusen Psych, 1989, Durkin, 1990, Glatthorn, 1990, Idol, 1989, Miller, 1990, Purkey & Smith, 1985, Will, 1986). Lack of understanding or interest in special education from general educators, diverse interpretation of the legal mandates, and rigid funding formulas were also cited as obstacles to mainstreaming. Enhancers to mainstreaming were noted as hiring good regular/general educators, diversity in instruction in the mainstream, flexible scheduling and supportive principals.

4. In Communities A, B and C a secondary system of education has emerged which, in general terms, has not included the mainstream in it's development. Communities A and C, urban type cities with diverse multi-ethnic populations and fewer local resources than more affluent suburban neighbors Community B and D, have relied more on state and federal funding for program development. Subsequently, they have had to be more concerned with compliance and due process issues to insure receipt of funds, than mainstreaming or integration of students with disabilities (Negri, 1991 Reynolds, Wang & Walberg, 1987, Will, 1986).

5. Compliance issues and underfunded mandates continue as dominant concerns for special education administrators. These middle managers have been

assigned the unenviable position of providing a free and appropriate education for all students with disabilities which will maximize the student's potential in the least restrictive environment. However, loss of local budget control and the tax cap of Proposition 2 1/2 have created annual administrative challenges (nightmares) for educators who are now required to spend inordinate amounts of time competing for fewer tax dollars in each community. Additionally, the special education administrator has become the primary negotiator for the school system in disputes with parents, attorneys, school committees, state and federal regulatory agencies; a role for which most school administrators have been un-trained and are ill-prepared to adopt (Bander, 1982, Bloom & Garfunkel, 1981, Boscardin, 1987, Budoff & Orenstein, 1982, Hausman, 1985, Katsiyannis & Kiare, 1991, McGarry & Finan, 1982).

Discussion and Relevance of Findings

In the Regular Education Initiative proposal, Will (1986) concurs that the principal needs to be in full control of all programs and resources within his/her building. However, the research confirms that most school systems have developed separate administrative arrangements for students with special needs; a

secondary system. Most administrators view the responsibility for these students as belonging to special education. Although services are delivered at the building level, a majority of principals have not developed ownership of the programs or responsibility for the student with a learning disability. Some have tried and been successful in the face of great resistance, i.e., the elementary principal in community A.

Initially, the specialist (special educator) was billed as the expert/savior and subsequently tended to nurture and extol this view within the existing school cultures. This perception was also supported by general educators who all too readily deferred to the specialist for problem students. It was also reinforced by the state and federal funding formulas which reimbursed municipalities only for services to students with special needs. As special education became more prominent in public schools, many teachers began to refer excessive numbers of students with problems in reading and math for special education services. Special education may have become the "dumping" ground for students who are difficult to teach, but who are not in any observable sense handicapped. This seems to be particularly true for minority students (Gersten & Woodward, 1990, Reynolds,

Wang, & Walberg 1987, Singer, 1986, Yates, 1988). According to Wetzel (1987), special education students are more likely than non-disabled students to come from low income single-parent families with heads of households who have relatively little education. Researchers also have demonstrated that once a student has been identified with special needs and service is provided, it is rare that they leave the rolls of special education (Morvant, George, Gersten & Woodward 1990, Singer & Butler, 1987).

In this study there are incidents of ownership reported by the elementary building principals in all communities. Community C elementary principal did not express either a full sense of ownership or a successful collaboration with special education to program for students with disabilities within the mainstream. He shared his sense of frustration regarding the assignment of one special education staff member by the special education director to his building implying that he had no voice in the placement decision. Despite this, he attempted to pilot a team teaching program with his fourth grade regular education teacher to include this special educator to provide instruction within the mainstream fourth grade class. Hence, he chose to transform a negative situation to an advantageous one utilizing his power as

building principal. Characteristically, he deferred to the need for a strong special education coordinator as essential to acquisition of services for his students, identifying this position as a central office power conduit between the special education administrator and the district building. Elementary principals interviewed from community A and B also reflected a sense of ownership for all students within their buildings, despite differing resistance to attempts to integrate students with disabilities.

There appears to be a different dynamic for middle school/junior high administrators interviewed. Community A middle school principal was absorbed with the first year implementation of the middle school concept and instituting "team teaching" with his mainstream staff. Special educators were not included as members of the team in this setting. He also viewed students with special needs as the responsibility of the central administrator of special education in this urban city. Community B assistant junior high school principal recognized a need to improve communication between specialists and mainstream staff, but expressed a sense of powerlessness in being able to initiate and find support within her generally-disinterested-in special-education building community. Community C middle school principal maintained a moderate to high

level of ownership for special education students in terms of crisis support to special education teachers, an attempt to develop consistent curriculum, institute a cooperative approach to instruction and grade students according to their individual potential, but clearly relied on her special educators to manage individually, their existence within the building. Although this middle school has been evolving for five years, the self-contained special education teachers are not yet members of the cluster team.

The special education teachers from Community A, C and D all identified isolation and lack of acknowledgement from peers as difficult factors in their professional well-being. Community C and D teachers are assigned to self-contained programs. On the other hand, the regular educator instructors interviewed from Community A, B and C, felt left out of the instruction, methodology and assessment decisions of student progress when children were pulled-out of class for remediation. In contrast, the regular education teacher from Community D expressed a high level of involvement with special educators and students with learning disabilities in her building, perhaps indicative of the general philosophy of Community D. Both community D principals evidenced much greater control and responsibility for their

students with disabilities and special education staff. There was also a greater sense of integration and emphasis on collaboration reported from this affluent suburban system. The special education director ironically, reported occasional feelings of isolation, in contrast to staff and principals who, for the most part, are aligned with each other. This may stem from her experience as buffer and negotiator for disputed issues between parents and schools. Although, she feels very supported by her administrators, the Pupil Personnel Director and Superintendent, her position becomes the target for expressions of anger, disappointment and frustration when parents, teachers or principals are in disagreement.

Conclusions

The relationship between the special and general educators has been characterized as one of conflict and dissonance (Glatthorn 1990, Miller 1990). Each has a different perception of teaching and learning: individualized/ small group instruction vs. class achievement. Methods and materials are often incompatible when instructing the same students and no time is built into school structures for collaboration, mutual observation and planning. The regular education environment or mainstream has been generally

neglected by special education practitioners and researchers until recently. Although the majority of administrators who responded to the survey described their style of leadership as collaborative (the ideal) they described the actual process with much more emphasis on insuring due process rights; making strides in cooperation, but, in reality, very far from a collaborative model.

A decade and a half later, issues of compliance continue to dominate and concern school administrators. Legislative, procedural, legal and technical issues overwhelm mainstream educators. The gatekeepers have <u>had</u> to be the special education administrators, a role assigned, unconsciously perhaps, by school committees and superintendents. A "check-point-Charlie" attitude permeates the perception and reporting of the special education administrators interviewed. Community A and C, representing two inner city, socioeconomic and ethnically diverse communities, have experienced the most intense scrutiny from state and federal regulators. Compliance with the mandates continues as an administrative priority for both these communities. Non-compliance equals loss of funds for local communities.

A primary concern of administrators is whether or not evaluations conform with time-lines established by law and if procedural rights have been followed. In a recent study conducted by Antonis Katsiyannis and Kathe Klare (1991) investigating state practices in Due Process Hearings, Massachusetts had the third highest number of special education hearings scheduled during 1988. This state was first in terms of cost of hearings, averaging $ 5,500.00 per hearing, excluding legal fees, compared to Alaska at $ 300.00 and Rhode Island at $ 500.00. In 1988, 374 Massachusetts' hearings were scheduled and 51 decisions were rendered. The discrepancy between hearings and decisions is attributed to effective mediation practices, cost-effectiveness reasons, and the increasing sophistication of service delivery by educational agencies. The attorney's fees provision is cited as another possible factor according to Katsiyannis and Klare (1991). The respondents to this study also reported that procedural issues were the focus of appeals to the detriment of substantive considerations (p.56-57).[75] "However, a clear definition of learning disabilities does not exist... Characteristics of learning disabled students vary from district to district, and sometimes from school to school within a district" (Gersten & Woodward 1990 p.7).[76] Quality

of service is becoming an emerging concern but has yet to be the primary focus of local school administrators. It will not become a concern for local communities until the state and federal regulators make the shift from auditing procedural compliance to monitoring quality of program outcomes (Landau, 1987, McGill-Franzen & Allington 1990).

Within the four systems studied, the response to the survey questions and the interview queries clearly define the existence of two separate systems of administration in Communities A, B and C. The long standing integration policies in Community D and the role of the principal as operationally responsible for the education of all students are contributing factors to a more unified system of education. School-based administrators provide support to staff for flexible scheduling and consistent time for collaboration and consultation. Community D has also a long term commitment to staff development which is reported as sporadic to non-existent in each of the other communities. Community A has instituted a two year commitment to voluntary training for teachers in cooperative education, held after school hours. Community B is in the second of two years of a new reading instruction program for voluntary staff. Training is scheduled for after school and some weekend

time. Community C has a variety of programs from mainstreaming at one elementary school, to cooperative learning at another and the middle school, to improved administrative and evaluative techniques for principals. Teachers workshops are scheduled on a half-day every eight weeks and after school. Administrative workshops are scheduled during the school day when they are released from assigned duties once each month.

Recommendations

This descriptive study of how the middle managers, principals and special education administrators from four neighboring North-of Boston seaside communities have implemented and incorporated the special education mandates cannot be generalized to the greater educational community. However, the reactions and revelations reported significantly align with much of the current research and trends reported for the next decade. Educational trends projected for the 1990's by the Office of the Secretary of Education include:

1. affirm a desirability for programming in the least restrictive environment.

2. a sharp decrease in assistance to reform institutions through litigation.

3. a shift in regulatory practices from monitoring procedure to monitoring outcomes of service.

4. a greater increase in integration of services with greater coordination across disciplines, agencies and settings but also greater differences in how to achieve this goal.

5. little consensus for integrating funding across designated categorical reimbursement programs.

6. greater concern with the rate of change in systems and programs.

A wide range of special education services exists in all school systems across the country, including the four neighboring North-of-Boston communities studied. Progressive inclusion were the two words used by Maynard Reynolds to describe the history and future of special education (1989). This author would add the word dilatorily as more aptly descriptive of the inclusion of students with observable handicaps within public schools. These services have relied on formal mandates and regulations to establish direction and expectations for students with disabilities. As social history has documented, it is much easier to maintain the status quo than to change. Mandates have been useful in unlocking rigid systems. Mandates alone cannot create successful change, but they can make a significant difference when applied with care and concern for the culture and it's citizens (Huberman & Miles 1984, Loucks-Horsley & Roody 1990). The most successful change occurs simultaneously top-down and bottom-up (Fullan 1982). School improvement, historically, is always met with a high degree of

resistance and resolve not to accommodate innovation. "Change threatens the professions's hard-won security and fragile position in the world" (Miller p.17).[76] The passage of special education legislation was an event that initiated change. Change is a process that requires time to implement and incorporate and almost always in the face of great resistance. This key legislation ensured services be delivered; that has happened in most all school systems. The next stage will focus on quality of programs, instruction and service to students with disabilities.

In this second stage of educational reform educators have begun to focus on making schools better learning environments for all students and better work environments for adults (p.19).[77] The regular education initiative is an idea whose time has come. The pendulum has swung from one extreme to another. It's swing back will bring old and new innovations, some of which will eventually meld. The research on educational reform has consistently equated successful change with the identification of the principal as the instructional leader. However, recent research has found that a configuration of players was essential to implement and sustain meaningful change. Gersten and Woodward (1990) propose that the local change facilitator be a central office figure who coordinates

the day-to day details of the implementation. Miller (1990) cites the need for leadership to come from an "idea champion", whether it be superintendent, principal or teacher may not make any difference. Principals have begun to shift from gatekeepers to change-agents providing support to staff in a less authoritarian manner. Teachers need to be active participants in any change and it must prove effective for positive growth in both teacher and student.

The role of the special education administrator will also need to shift from gatekeeper to change-agent, or "idea-champion". An equal and collaborative partnership with principals will need to be established to restructure and incorporate the principles of the Regular Education Initiative (REI). Decentralization of special education and incorporation into building based management is the REI goal. It's reality will require change agents with a mutual vision, respect, responsibility and clear understanding of the original intent of special education, a support service for regular education. This will require a giving back of power too readily abdicated when special education came into existence. And it will require a willingness on the part of the regular educator to accept this power and accompanying responsibility. Both the regular and special educator, administrators

and teachers will need time to absorb, discuss, negotiate, decide and act more as partners than adversaries. Eventually, the role of the special education administrator should be disolved and fully absorbed by the mainstream administrator.

It is important to note that Massachusetts special education law is currently being considered for change in order to be more aligned with the federal mandates. An area of great controversy is the proposed change in the role of the special education administrator, who, according to Chapter 766, assigns prototype (equates with placement) based on team recommendations. In simple terms this administrator has the last word in assigning placement. The federal law requires the team to recommend and assign service delivery and placement. If this legislation is amended by the legislature, the role of the Massachusetts Special Education Director will be greatly propelled toward a more collaborative model.

Forging a partnership between general and special educators will be essential to the successful implementation of the Regular Education Initiative and restructuring reform. Many options have been suggested in the current research to include teachers in the participation and decisions related to changing the

learning and teaching environment. <u>There is no one best method.</u> A tolerance for unique ideas to be tried and continually adapted with feedback from peers, supervisors, students and parents is essential to creative success. At the same time, this historically is most difficult within traditional education systems. Each school sytem or building-based management team will have to develop an approach to restructuring in accord with it's own culture and traditions. Provisions should be made for teachers to share leadership, exchange ideas in a continuous dialogue of concepts, observe each other work, be empowered to try-out new concepts in classrooms, provide peer feedback and receive support from peers and administrators. Teachers and administrators need to form networks and partnerships with professionals in other schools and districts to enrich their own repertoire and practice.

> As partnerships develop, they will require new management and leadership approaches. They may start with resources for doing more of the same, but they cannot end there. They may begin with shared activities and diverse ends, but they should then foster communication that promotes some shared goals and some diverse means. They open with teachers in traditional roles but must gradually build enthusiasm and empower a new professionalism. They must allow new understandings and dynamics to unlock possibilities and foster new strategies and structures. (Jones & Maloy, 1988, p.153-154)[79]

ENDNOTES CHAPTER V

[75] Antonis Katsiyannis and Kathe Klare,(1991) State practices in due process hearings: Considerations for better practice. RASE 12(2) p.56-57.

[76] Russell Gersten and John Woodward, (1990) Rethinking the regular education initiative: Focus on the classroom teacher. RASE 11(3) p.7.

[77] Lynne Miller, (1990) The regular education initiative and school reform: Lessons from the mainstream. RASE 11(3) p.17

[78] L. Miller, (1990) p. 19

[79] Byrd L. Jones and Robert W. Maloy, Partnerships for improving schools (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, Inc. 1988) p.153-154

APPENDIX A

CHAPTER 766 PROTOTYPE DEFINITIONS

502.0 A child placed in any program prototype shall be eligible, on the same basis as other children, for the auxiliary, supportive and remedial services that are provided as part of the regular education program to which the child may be assigned.

502.1 Regular education program with modifications.

502.2 Regular education program with no more than 25% time out of the mainstream.

502.3 Regular education program with no more than 60% of class time out of regular education.

502.4 Substantially separate program made up entirely of children in need of special education not to exceed more than eight students with one teacher, or twelve students with a teacher and an aide, provided within public school regular education facilities.

502.4i Notwithstanding 502.4, a school committee may operate a substantially separate special education program in a facility other than a public school regular education facility, provided that the program is reviewed and approved by the Regional Branch Office of the Division prior to implementation and annually thereafter.

502.5 Day School program: Each school committee shall arrange for the provision of programs within this prototype to each child in need of special education only when the nature or severity of the special need is such that education in a less restrictive prototype with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. A Day School Program is located at a facility other than a public school regular education facility.

5021.6 Residential School program: Each School committee shall arrange for the provision of a program within this prototype to each child in need of special education for whom an IEP specifies such a program based on a finding by the Administrator of Special Education, upon recommendation by the TEAM, that a residential school program is necessary to meet the

educational goals and objectives in the IEP. A child shall live in this facility.

502.7 Home or Hospital Program.

502.7(a) The child's physician rather than an IEP specifies the home or hospital placement without team involvement. Instruction is provided by a teacher/tutor assigned by the school committee at the child's home or hospital when a child is confined for a period of not less than fourteen days or more than sixty days during a school year. This program shall also be provided, upon request, for a chronically ill child who will be at home for recurrent periods of less than 14 days.

502.7(b) Children who qualify for such program: A child who would qualify for a 7(a) program except that the physician has referred the child for an evaluation; a child who will remain in the hospital for more than 60 days in order not to endanger the health or safety of such child or that of others; The administrator of special education shall refer such child for an evaluation and shall be responsible for advising the physician when the fifty day period is about to expire; a child who is in, or is about to be placed in a pediatric nursing home or long term care facility for rehabilitative services.

502.8 Program for children ages three and four:

5028(a) Home based programs at least weekly visits with parents of three or four year olds.

502.8(b) Integrated center-based programs including up to 50% of children from the general population and less than 50% of children with special needs. Such programs shall be licensed by the Office for Children under applicable regulations and guidelines unless operated by a school committee. The maximum number of children in a class with a teacher and an aide is 15.

502.8(c) Separate center based programs for three and four year olds with substantial disabilities. Maximum number of students per class is nine with a teacher and an aide.

502.9 Diagnostic Programs: Each school committee shall provide a program within this prototype when the Team is unable to set objectives, or that assessments are so inconclusive, or where initial placement is needed for diagnostic or observational purposes. No child shall remain in this placement for more than 8 weeks. The TEAM must convene five days prior to the end of the diagnostic period to review assessments and observations and to develop goals and objectives.

502.10 Programs for children in need of special education who reside in certain facilities under the control of the State Departments of Mental Health, Public Health, and Youth Services, as well as other agencies so designated by the Board of Education.

502.11 Programs for children in need of special education who are fourteen through twenty-one. If no program within one or more of the program prototypes is suitable for a child in need of special education who is fourteen through twenty-one, the TEAM and the Administrator of Special Education shall identify or design a suitable program for such child. Subject to prior written approval of such program by the Division acting through its Regional Branch Office and subject to the provisions of article 207.0., the school committee shall provide or arrange for the provision of such program.

APPENDIX B

CHAPTER 766 ADMINISTRATOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

GENERAL PROVISIONS AND DUTIES

The general provisions and duties are copied from Chapter 2, page 4 and Chapter 3 page 20 of the Massachusetts Chapter 766 Regulations as printed May of 1986.

APPENDIX B

Chapter 2 - General Provisions

The following provisions shall be generally applicable to all of the chapters in these regulations.

200.0 Administrator of Special Education.

Each School committee shall appoint a person to be its Administrator of Special Education. such appointment shall be made in accordance with the following:

200.1 Each school committee with three thousand or more children enrolled in its school system shall appoint a person qualified pursuant to the requirements of the Board of Education's Regulations for the Certification of Educational Personnel (603 CMR 7.00) to be its Administrator of Special Education. Such Administrator shall devote full time to the duties involved in supervising the provision of all special education in the school system, including those duties listed in paragraph 310.0.

200.2 Each school committee with less than three thousand children enrolled in its school system shall appoint a person qualified pursuant to the requirements of the Board of Education's Regulations for the

Certification of Educational Personnel (603 CMR 7.00) to be its Administrator of Special Education. Such Administrator shall have the duties involved in supervising the provision of all special education in the school system, including those duties listed in paragraph 310.0. Such Administrator may have other duties if the special education duties are not such as to require the devotion of full time.

310.0 Evaluation: Administrator of Special Education; Duties.

The duties of the Administrator of Special Education, appointed pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 200.0, shall include the following:

310.1 Exercising general supervision over the identification, referral, evaluation and program planning for all children in need of special education.

310.2 Providing for the register and child count required by chapters 300.0 and 301.0.

310.3 Insuring that current records are kept of all information relating to evaluations required to be maintained by these regulations.

310.4 Where a school committee has less than three thousand children enrolled in its school system, the

Administrator of Special Education may be a member of a TEAM, a TEAM chairperson, or both.

310.5 Determining the organization of the Team and its composition in accordance with paragraphs 311.0,312.0 and 319.0.

310.6 Receiving referrals of children for evaluations and assigning such children to evaluations.

310.7 Maintaining a current list and description of program options available for children in need of special education as described in paragraph 501.2.

310.8 Working jointly with the TEAMs to find the best combination of educational and other services for each child in need of special education.

310.9 Working jointly with the TEAMs in recommending to the Division placement of children in need of special education in the program prototypes described in paragraph 502.5 (day school program) and paragraph 502.6 (residential school program).

310.10 Working jointly with the TEAMs in carrying out any other duties required by these regulations.

APPENDIX C

SUPERINTENDENT REQUEST LETTER

Dr. COMMUNITY ABCorD
Superintendent of Schools
ABCD Public Schools
North of Boston Community
Older City and Newer Suburb
Eastern, Massachusetts 09999

Dear Dr./Mr/s Superintendent of ABC or D Public Schools:

I am a graduate student at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, completing dissertation requirements for a doctoral degree at the School of Education. This letter is written to request your permission to conduct my research within your school system.

My research study will focus on the role of the Special and Regular Education Administrator as "gatekeepers" of the Chapter 766 mandates. How has the middle level manager implemented the regulations to maximize a students potential in the least restrictive setting?

Chapter 766 and Public Law 94-142 were enacted during a period of social activism and reform. The implementation of the law during the late 70's and 80's has been characterized by turbulence and controversy as the political climate became increasingly conservative. Proposition 2 1/2 limited fiscal resources and local control within Massachusetts. Cities with large, low income populations have experienced more difficulty than smaller, affluent communities in implementing this reform.

As you are painfully aware, the costs of special education have spiraled since inception. Although school enrollments have declined, the number of students in special education has increased.

The purpose of this study will be to learn how school administrators from four neighboring North of Boston communities have dealt with the changes; how they have reacted to legislative mandates with loss of fiscal autonomy for local school boards.

I would like to distribute a survey/questionnaire and conduct interviews with a special education administrator, two regular education administrators, one regular education teacher and a special education teacher from within your system. Your community will not be identified or named. It's characteristics and geographical location will be described and defined as Community

A-B-C or D. Staff participating in this study will be identified by role, i.e., elementary school principal. Participants in this study are free to withdraw consent and to discontinue participation in the research at any time without prejudice to the subject.

The findings of this study will become part of my doctoral dissertation. I will be happy to share the results of this study in it's completed form, and to consult with you on a regular basis as the investigation proceeds.

I would appreciate your consideration of this request. I will call you to schedule a meeting for further discussion.

Sincerely yours,

Hazel Grenham Fleming

cc: Dr. Kenneth Parker
Dissertation Chairperson
University of Massachusetts
School of Education
Amherst, MA
file

APPENDIX D

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL TO ADMINISTRATORS

October 30,1989

Dear Education Administrator:

I would appreciate a few minutes of your time to assist me with a research study focused on the role of the Special and Regular Education Administrator as " gatekeepers" of the special education regulations. The "how-to-'s of administering the special education mandates were not specifically defined but rather were left to an "open-ended interpretation". The process has not been easy or quick to implement.

Initial studies have indicated that cities with large low income populations have experienced more difficulty than smaller, affluent communities in implementing this reform. Additionally, Massachusetts voters passed a tax-limitation measure limiting resources available to budgets to 2 1/2 % of assessed property valuation and ended the fiscal autonomy of local school boards.

In a society where children are entitled to achieve their maximum potential, how do school managers allocate limited resources? How do you provide quality programs for all children within your community? How have you provided the maximum potential in the least restrictive environment?

There has been minimal investigation of the middle level manager. Are school administrators, principals and special education directors, the "gatekeepers" that influence regulatory implementation? Or are there other factors to be considered which impact on enforcement of special education mandates. Is it a combination of administrative style and constituent support or resistance which effects outcome?

I have enclosed a questionnaire for your consideration. Kindly complete and return to me by November 15,1989 in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope. Your community will not be identified or named specifically. It's characteristics and geographical location will be defined as Community A, B, C or D.

As a follow-up to this questionnaire, I will be interviewing education administrators and staff. I will contact you to schedule a mutually convenient time.

Results of this study will become part of my doctoral dissertation,to be completed through the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. I will be happy to share the results of this study in it's completed form. If you are interested, please send me your request in a separate envelope.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Hazel Grenham Fleming

APPENDIX E

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

Please complete the following and return in the attached envelope.

1.Current Position: Regular education administrator - Title_____

2.Current Position: Special Education administrator- Title_____

3.How long have you held this position?_____

4.City/Town:_____

5.Please state number of special education students in each of the identified prototypes within your school system or building, whichever is applicable.

502.1_____502.2_____

502.3_____502.4_____

502.4i_____502.5_____

502.6_____502.7_____

502.8b_____502.8c_____

502.9_____502.10_____502.11_____

6.How many regular education teachers, guidance/adjustment counselors/social workers are employed with your school system/building at present?_____elementary,_____ middle/jr.hi,_____high school.

7.How many special education teachers are employed within your school system or building at present?
___elementary,_____ middle/ jr.-hi,
____high school.

8.How many Chapter One teachers or tutors are employed by your system or building at present?_____.

9.How many Remedial Reading teachers or tutors are employed by your system or building at present?_____.

10.How many speech and language therapists?_____

11.Occupational Therapists?_____

12.Physical Therapists?_____

13.School Psychologists?_____

14.Do you use out of system consultants or specialists for evaluations?_____

15.In which discipline/s?_____

_____

16.Does your system or building/district utilize a pre-referral process? yes_____, no_____, unsure_____

17.How frequently are these meetings held? once a month_____,twice per month_____, every other month_____,every six weeks_____, other_____.

18.Who is responsible for conducting the pre-referral meetings?
__Building Principal, __Special Educator Administrator, __Regular Educator Staff,__ Special Educator Staff,__ Other: describe_____.

19.Does your system/building have a follow-up meeting to assess progress and status of action recommended at initial pre-referral meeting?____yes, _____no,_____unsure.

20.Does your system/building utilize a Child Study Team Model? yes_____ no_____ unsure_____.

21.How frequently does this body meet?___ once a month,___ twice a month,____ every other month,____ every six weeks, other_____.

22.Who is responsible for conducting these meetings? within your building or system: ___Principal, ___Special Education Administrator,___Regular Educator Staff,____Special Educator Staff, ___Other: please describe:_____.

23.Does your building/system have a follow-up meeting to assess or measure progress for the Child Study Team model ? ____yes,_____no,_____unsure.

24.Has your system presented unresolved cases for Appeals Hearing within the last 5 years? ____yes _____no ____unsure

25.To the best of your knowledge, within your system/building:
How many disputed IEP's were resolved through the Hearing Process since 1985.? 1 to 3,_____ 4 to 7_____, 8 to 11_____.

26.--How many disputed IEP's were resolved through mediation within the last five years?1 to 3,_____4 to 7_____,8 to 11_____. 11 to _____

27.Have you coordinated , chaired and/or participated in a mediation session? ___yes, ____no.
Role:_____

28.Have you coordinated, chaired and/or participated in an appeals hearing on behalf of this school system?_____yes,_____no.

29.Has your system instituted new or alternative programs as a result of an Appeals decision/s?
yes_____, no_____, unsure_____.

30.Identify: kind of students served as a result of Appeals or Mediation Decision:- please indicate #'s of students in each category:
student with:___ mild learning disability, __ moderate learning disability, ___mild developmental delays,____ moderate developmental delays,_____ severe developmental delays, _____ other:
describe_____.

31.Identify : kind of program developed as a result of Appeals or Mediation decision/s. _____ generic

support within a regular class,_____ pull-out remediation within a "resource center,"____self-contained class for behavioral management,____ self- contained class for pervasive developmental delays, _____ other: describe_____

32.When does your school system administer Kindergarten Screening?_____ Spring or _____Fall.

33.Is the Kindergarten Screening coordinated by a regular educator_____ or special educator____or both_____?

34.When does your school system administer Early Childhood Screening for 2 1/2 year olds to 4 year old children?
_____Spring,_____Fall,_____Winter.

35.Is the Early Childhood Screening coordinated by a regular educator_____ or special educator_____ or both_____?

36.How are the results of these screenings used for planning and program development? _____system review meeting,_____building / review,_____ department review

37.Which administrative model is implemented by your system?

Pupil Personnel Services ____
Special Education Services ____
Special Services ____

Please attach a copy of your organizational model, or describe in your own terms, including title of top administrator/s and supporting professional staff within this model.

38.Please circle the term that most nearly describes your administrative style:

-didactic - authoritarian - collaborative - non-directive -other.

39.Please describe your style of administration in your own terms: (space provided - other side)

Thank you for your time and participation.
I will call you to schedule a follow-up interview.

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

The purpose of this interview is to obtain a field based perspective from the regular and special education administrators, the key middle-managers who act as "gatekeepers" of the federal and state mandates governing education for the student with handicaps.

1.Identify your model of administration:
- Pupil Personnel Services
- Special Education Services
- Special Services

2.Please describe how this model is implemented within your school system? An Organizational Chart would be helpful.

3.Please describe your system/building efforts to promote mainstreaming of special needs students within regular education:

4.Please describe your system/buildings collaboration between regular and special education staff.

5.Has your system/building provided any training for staff relative to mainstreaming?

Please describe:

6.In the daily process of implementing the special education regulations; what or who enhances the process?_____
and what or who inhibits or obstructs the process?_____
within your system and/or community?_____

Please explain using specific examples.

7.Kindly focus on the relationship with your superintendent: as s/he is the ultimate line of authority and has the responsibility for enforcing all educational regulations, and school committee policy, how supportive has this person been to your role as special education administrator/ or regular education administrator? Please describe in your own terms.

8.Let's focus on the relationship with your school committee:
this body usually defines policy which represents the educational interests of a community. How supportive is this governing body to your role as an administrator responsible for enforcing the special education mandates?
Please describe in your own terms:

9.Parent Support and Involvement: Please describe the parent support and actual involvement within your building or system. How helpful is this group to implementing the goals of special education and mainstreaming?

10. Interaction between regular and special education staff, please characterize and describe in your own terms.

11. Does the relationship between regular and special education seem to make a difference regarding mainstreaming students with handicaps? In what ways can this relationship be different in order to enhance integration?

12. What are your personal recommendations for improving mainstreaming opportunities for students with handicaps within your school system?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AASA/NAESP/NASSP School-Based Management Task Force. (1988). School-based management: A strategy for better learning. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Apgar, K. R.. Memorandum March 10, 1986, to Massachusetts Special Education Directors from Department of Education, Legal department advisory opinion re: David D. vs. Dartmouth School Committe.

Babbie, E. R., Survey research methods. Belmont CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973.

Bander, Diana O..(1982) Special education in Massachusetts 1965-1978: A portrait of persistence and change in social policy.(Ed.D Dissertation, Harvard University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 43/06-A 1921.

Bauwens, Jeanne, Hourcade, J. J., & Friend, M. (1989) Cooperative Teaching: A Model for General and Special Education Integration, RASE(10) 2, 18 -22.

Berdie, D. R. & Anderson, J. R..Questionnaires: Design and use. New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.. Federal programs supporting educational change. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation 1978.

Bloom, M. Special education decision-making in an urban school system. Ed.D Dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1980.

Bloom, M.& Garfunkel, F.(1981) Least restrictive environments and parent-child rights: A paradox. Urban Education, 15 (4), 379-401.

Bruininks, R. H. & Lakin, K. C.. (1985) Perspectives and prospects for social and educational integration. In R. H. Bruininks & K. Charlie Lakin (Eds) Living and learning in the least restrictive environment. Baltimore: Brookes Publishing Co..

Budoff, M..(1975) Engendering change in special education practices Harvard Education Review,45,(4) 507-528.

Budoff, M., and Orenstein, A..Due process in special education: On going to a hearing. Cambridge,MA: Brookline Books,1982.

Boscardin, M. L.. (1987) Local level special education due process hearings: Cost issues surrounding individual student differences, Journal of Education Finance, Winter 391-402.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986) A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century (The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession). Hyattsville, Md. Author.

Chalfant, J. C., & Van Dusen Pysh, M..(1989) Teacher assistance teams: Five descriptive studies on 96 teams. RASE 10(6) 49-58.

Cohen, M..Instructional management and social conditions in effective schools. In A. O. Webb & L. D. Webb (Eds.) School Finance and school improvement: Linkages in the 1980's. Cambridge: Ballinger 1983.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, Regulations for the Implementation of Chapter 766 of the acts of 1972: The Comprehensive Special Education Law (Chapter 766 Regulations) as amended May 22, 1986 to be effective September 1, 1986. Boston: Author.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988) The futures of teaching. Educational Leadership, 46(3) 4-10.

David D. etc., v. Dartmouth School Committee, 775 F 2d 411 (Mass Cir. 1985).

Durkin, D. (1990) Matching classroom instruction with reading abilities: An unmet need. RASE 11(3) 23-28

Earley, J. B. (1985) A study to determine whether the special education administrative model enhances the integration of special needs students into regular education, (Ed.D. dissertation , University of Massachusetts) Dissertation Abstracts International, 46/03-A 564.

Education Letter staff (1989) The mainstreaming debate. Harvard Graduate School of Education,Education Letter 5(2) 1-5.

Fullan, M. The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1982.

Garfunkel, F. & Bloom, M..(1980) Litigation as a means of enforcing education reform", Education Unlimited 2 34-42.

Gay, L. R.. Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and application. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus,1987.

Gerber, M. M.. Applications of cognitive-behavioral training methods to teaching basic skills to mildly handicapped elementary school students. In M. C. Wang, M. C. Reynolds, & H. J.Walberg (Eds.) Handbook of special education: Research and practice. Vol.I. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987.

Gersten, R., Carnine, D., & Woodward, J..(1987) Direct instruction in research: The third decade. RASE 8(6) 48-56.

Gersten, R., Walker, H.,& Darch, C.(1988) Relationship between teachers effectiveness and their tolerance for handicapped students. Exceptional Children 54(5) 433-438.

Gersten, R. & Woodward, J..(1990) Rethinking the regular education initiative: Focus on the classroom teacher. RASE 11(3) 7-16.

Glatthorn, A. A..(1990) Cooperative professional development: Facilitating the growth of the special education teacher and the classroom teacher. RASE 11(3) 29-39.

Gliedman, J. & Roth, W. The unexpected minority: Handicapped children in America. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980.

Goodlad, J.. Dynamics of educational change. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.

_____. A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill 1984.

Gordon, R. L..Interviewing: Strategy, techniques and tactics. Homewood III.: The Dorsey Press 1975.

Greer, J. V.. (1989) The prime factor in education. Exceptional Children 56(3) 191-193.

Hanline, M. F. & Halvorsen, A. (1989) Parent perceptions of the integration transition process: Overcoming artificial barriers,Exceptional Children 55(6) 487-492.1989.

Haynes, J. E.(1982) Democracy and due process: The case of handicapped children. Regulation Nov-Dec 1982.

Haynes, M. C. & Jenkins,J. R.(1986) Reading instruction in special education resource rooms. American Educational Research Journal 23(2) 161-190.

Hausman, B. S.(1985). Mandates without money: Negotiated enforcement of special education regulations (retrenchment, bargaining) (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University) Dissertation Abstracts International, 2060 46/07-A.

Hodgkinson, H. L.. All one system: Demographics of education- kindergarten through graduate school. Washington,D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1985.

Holmes Group. Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author, 1986.

Huberman, A. & Miles, M..Innovation up close: A field study in twelve school settings. Andover, MA: Network 1982.

_____.Innovation up close. New York: Plenum 1984.

Idol, L. (1989) The resource consulting teacher: An integrated model of service delivery. RASE 10(6) 38-48.

Jones, B. L. & Maloy, R. W.. Partnerships for improving schools. Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press, 1988.

Kagan, R..(1981) Regulating business, regulating schools: The problem of regulatory unreasonableness. (Report # 81-A14) Palo Alto: Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.

_____.(1984) Regulatory enforcement styles. Paper presented to Annual Meeting of Law and Society Association. Boston, MA.

Katsiyannis, A. & Klare, K.. (1991) State practices in due process hearings: Considerations for better practice. RASE 12(2) 56-57.

Kauffman, J. & Pullen, P.. (1989) An historical perspective: A personal perspective on our history of service to mildly handicapped and at-risk-students. RASE 10(6) 12-14.

Kirp, D., Buss, W., & Kuriloff, P..(1974) Legal reform of special education: Empirical studies and procedural proposals. California Law Review, 62 41-155.

Knoff, H. M..(1984) Mainstreaming attitudes and special placement knowledge in labeling versus nonlabeling states. RASE5(6) 7-14.

Kotin, L. & Eager, N. B.. Due process in special education: A Legal analysis. Cambridge, MA: Research Institute for Educational Problems, 1977.

Landau, J. K.. Out of the mainstream: Education of disabled youth in Massachusetts. Boston: Massachusetts Advocay Center, 1987.

Little, J. W.. School success and staff development: The role of staff development in urban desegregated schools. Boulder: Colorado Center for Action Research 1981.

Lloyd, J. W., Keller, C. E., Kauffman, J. M., & Hallahan, D. P..(1988 January) What will the regular education initiative require of general education teachers? Report submitted to Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U. S. Department of Education.

Loucks-Horsley, S. & Roody, D. S.. (1990) Using what is known about change to inform the regular education initiative. RASE 11(3) 51-56.

Malloy, J.(1980). The role of the administrator of special education in implementing comprehensive special education mandates, (Ph.D Dissertation, Boston College).

Massachusetts Bar Association. Recent developments in special education law. A seminar paper presented by the Massachusetts Bar Association- Public Law Section., April 1988.

Massachusetts Department of Education, Facts on special education in Massachusetts. Quincy, MA: Author,1988 Publication no. 153331-18-3000.

Massachusetts Department of Education (1988) October 1 Census School System Summary Report, Quincy: Department of Education.

McGarry,J.,Finan, P. L..Implementing Massachusetts special education law: A state wide assessment, Final report. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Washington, D.C.: Boston Division/Special Education of Mass State Dept of Education, April 1983.

McGill-Franzen, A. & Allington, R. L..(1990) REI: An entitlement to sufficient instruction. RASE 11(3) 59-61.

Miller, L. (1990) The regular education initiative and school reform: Lessons from the mainstream. RASE 11(3) 17-22.

_____& Lieberman, A. (1988) School improvement in the United States: Nuance and numbers. Qualitative Studies in Education 1(1) 3-19.

Moore, M. T., Strong, E. W., Schwartz, M. & Braddock, M.. Patterns in special education service delivery and cost. Washington D.C.: Decision Resources Corp.,1988.

Morvant, M., George, N., Gersten, R.,& Woodward, J.. Special education services for inner city students. Eugene: University of Oregon 1990.

Murphy, Lamere & Murphy, Attorneys at Law.(1986) Memorandum to All Special Education clients, Re: Handicapped Children's Protection Act. Braintree MA: Author.

Negri, G. (1991, March 28) Assimilation urged for special ed. The Boston Globe pp.1 & 11.

O'Reilly, R. C., Sayler, M. R..(1985) Handicapped children in schools: Administrators and the courts. Revised. paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Starkville, MS.(Ed 264 639)

Osborne, A. G. (1989) Reimbursement of private school tuition to parents since Burlington. RASE 10(5) 58-62.

Patton, M.. Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills : Sage Publications, 1980.

Public Law 94-142, Education For All Handicapped Act, November 29, 1975, amended August 5, 1986 to the Handicapped Children's Protection Act and amended again in October 1990 to the Individual With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Purkey, S. C. & Smith, M. S..(1985) School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. Elementary School Journal 85 353-389.

Reynolds, M.C..(1989) An historical perspective: The delivery of special education the mildly disabled and at-risk-students. RASE 10(6) 7-11.

_____, Wang, M.C. & Walberg, H..(1987) The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children 53 391-398.

Semmel, M. L., Gottlieb, J., & Robinson, N.M..(1979) Mainstreaming: Perspectives on education of handicapped children in the public schools. In D.C. Berliner (Ed.) Review of research in education Vol. 7.. Washington D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Singer, J. D., Butler, J.,Palfrey, S., & Walker, D. K..(1986) Characteristics of special education placements: Findings from probability samples in five metropolitan school districts. Journal of Special Education 20(3) 319-337.

Singer, J. D., & Butler, J. A..(1987) The Education of all handicapped children act: Schools as agents of social reform. Harvard Educational Review 57(2) 125-152.

Sarason, S..The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1982.

Sudman, S., & Bradbury, N.. Asking questions: A practical guide to questionnaire design. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass, Inc. 1982.

Tindall, G., Germann, G., Marston, D., & Deno, S..(1983) The effectiveness of special education: A Direct measurement approach. University of Minnesota Research Report # 123, Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities, Department of Education. (Ed 236 846) 1- 72.

Vaughn, M., & Shearer, A., Mainstreaming in Massachusetts: How special education became ordinary in one state in America. Cambridge, MA.:Brookline Books,1986.

Walker, A. (1990, March 11) Schools wrangle with expense of special -needs programs. The Boston Globe pp. 25-26.

Wang, M. C. & Zollers, N.. (1990) Adaptive instruction: An alternative services delivery approach. RASE 11(1) 7-21.

Weatherley, R.. Reforming special education: Policy implementation from state level to street level. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1979.

West, J. F., & Idol, L. (1990) Collaborative consultation in the education of mildly handicapped and at-risk-students. RASE 11(1) 22-31.

Wetzel, J.R.. American youth: A statistical snapshot. Washington, D.C.: William T. Grant Foundation Commission on work, Family and Citizenship, 1987.

Wiederhold, J. L. & Chamberlain, S.P. (1989) A critical analysis of resource programs. RASE 10(6) 15-37.

Will, M.(1986). Educating students with learning problems-a shared responsibility.(Report to the Secretary Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services) Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education.

Yates, J. R.. (1988) Demography as it affects special education. In A.A. Ortiz and B. A. Ramirez (Eds.) Schools and the culturally diverse exceptional student: Promising practices and future directions. Reston,VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Yell, M. L., & Espin, C.. (1990) The handicapped children's protection act of 1986: Time to pay the piper? Exceptional Children 56(5) 396-407.

Yerchak,Mary Jane;Bryk, A.,Desanctis, J., CHAPTER 766: Coordinated case studies. Cambridge, MA.:Huron Institute, 1981.

Yin, R.K..Case study research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.

Ysseldyke, J.E., Thurlow,M.L., Graden, J.,Wesson, C., Algozzine, B., & Deno, S. (1983) Generalization from five years of research on assessment and decision making. Exceptional Education Quarterly 4 75-94.